DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 697 EC 301 312

AUTHOR Kofsky, Gale E.
TITLE Increasing the Number of Minority Elementary Students Found Eligible for Placement in a Gifted Program by Enhancing the Quality of Screening Instruments and Inservice Training Provided to School Staff.
PUB DATE 12 Mar 92
NOTE 115p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; Blacks; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; *Eligibility; Hispanic Americans; Incidence; Inservice Education; Limited English Speaking; *Minority Groups; Preschool Education; *Referral; *Screening Tests; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This practicum attempted to increase the number of minority elementary students in prekindergarten through grade 5 found eligible for placement in a gifted program by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the screening instruments and by providing inservice training to increase the understanding of gifted characteristics and program eligibility by school staff. Four hands-on inservice training sessions were used to familiarize teachers, counselors, and administrators in target schools with a preselected group of norm referenced screening instruments and with characteristics common to gifted minority and limited English proficient children. A matrix was developed to assist the Child Study Team in its review of referral information. The program met all four of its objectives: (1) a 10 percent increase in the percentage of Black and Hispanic students found eligible for placement in a gifted program; (2) an increase in the number of Black and Hispanic students screened for gifted testing in 80 percent of the low referring schools; (3) an increase in the percentage of young (prekindergarten through grade 2) minority students screened; and (4) improvement in the understanding of gifted characteristics and eligibility criteria of teachers and administrators. Appendixes include a record sheet of gifted screening information, the survey of gifted identification procedures and practices, an assessment of characteristics of giftedness, and a pilot gifted screening program log sheet. (64 references) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED346697

Increasing the Number of Minority Elementary Students Found Eligible for Placement in a Gifted Program by Enhancing the Quality of Screening Instruments and Inservice Training Provided to School Staff

by

Gale E. Kofsky

Cluster 34

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gale E. Kofsky
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Practicum Report presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1992

EC 301312

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Joseph P. Burke
Dr. Joseph P. Burke

Director of Operations, Region I
Title

Hialeah, Florida
Address

March 3, 1992
Date

This practicum report was submitted by Gale Kofsky under the direction of the adviser listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

3/12/92
Date of Final Approval of Report

Polly Peterson mbr
Polly Peterson, Ph. D., Adviser

DEDICATION

This practicum is dedicated to three people whose wisdom, love, and understanding has guided me through this experience. They are my loving husband, Paul; my "adopted" mother, Gladys Lipton; and one of my closest friends and editor, Jon Page.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Bob Conner and Ms. Karen Shrontz who graciously shared their insights and expertise about gifted identification. Without their support this project would not have been possible.

Special thanks goes to each of the school counselors, psychologists, teachers of the gifted and academic excellence, and assistant principals at each of the targeted schools. Their participation at the inservice training sessions and the time they spent administering and scoring the screening instruments used in this project was greatly appreciated.

I am especially grateful to Mr. Burke, the past Region I Coordinating Principal of Exceptional Student Education /Federal Programs, for facilitating the successful implementation and completion of this practicum. His guidance and understanding have been invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

LIST OF TABLES.....v

ABSTRACT.....vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION.....1

Description of Work Setting and Community.....1
Writer's Work Setting and Role.....4

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM.....8

Problem Description.....8
Problem Documentation.....15
Causative Analysis.....23
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature....27

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS.....34

Goals and Expectations.....34
Behavioral Objectives.....34
Measurement of Objectives.....35
Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events.....41
Description of Plans for Analyzing Results.....42

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY.....44

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions..44
Description and Justification for Solution Selected.....53
Report of Action Taken.....60

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....66

Results.....66
Discussion.....75
Recommendations.....84
Dissemination.....85

REFERENCES 87

Appendices

A	RECORD SHEET OF GIFTED SCREENING INFORMATION	93
B	SURVEY OF GIFTED IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES	98
C	ASSESSMENT OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTEDNESS	103
D	PILOT SCREENING PROGRAM LOG SHEET	105

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Tables

1 Rate of Gifted Testing By Elementary Schools During the 1990-92 School Year.....17

2 A Comparison of Enrollment Figures and Ethnic Distribution at Targeted Schools.....18

3 An Analysis of Gifted Referral Rates by Grade Level.....21

4 Rate of Gifted Eligibility Prior to Implementation.....69

5 Number of Minority Students Tested and Found Eligible for a Gifted Program.....70

6 Comparison of Students Screened for Gifted with Total School Enrollment Figures in Low Referring Schools.....71

7 Comparison of Gifted Referrals by Grade and Year.....72

ABSTRACT

Increasing the Number of Minority Elementary Students Found Eligible for Placement in a Gifted Program by Enhancing the Quality of Screening Instruments and Inservice Training Provided to School Staff. Kofsky, G., 1992: Practicum Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Descriptors: Identification/Intelligence Tests/ K-BIT/Elementary Education/Early Childhood Education/Rating Scales/Gifted/Behavior Checklist/Limited English Speaking/ Minority Groups/Matrix.

This practicum aimed to increase the number of minority elementary students in prekindergarten through Grade 5 found eligible for placement in a gifted program by enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of screening instruments and by providing inservice training. The second goal was to increase the understanding of gifted characteristics and their relationship to eligibility by school staff.

Four hands-on inservice training sessions were utilized to familiarize teachers, counselors, and administrators in each of the targeted schools with a preselected group of norm referenced screening instruments and characteristics common to gifted minority and limited English proficient children. The practicum also developed a matrix to assist the Child Study Team in its review of referral information and to help the region monitor the quality of gifted referral packets. Schools targeted for assistance had been documented as referring less than one percent of their total population during the previous year. High referring schools, those who had tested two percent or more also participated in the pilot screening program. Each school representative received copies of the K-BIT, the Gifted Evaluation Scale (Hawthorne Educational Services) and Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire (American Guidance Service). The number of students screened was monitored monthly by analyzing computerized reports and log sheets. Inservice training in the identification of potential minority gifted children was also offered to each of the targeted schools. All participants took a posttest after the workshop.

Outcomes of this practicum were very positive. The criteria in each of the four objectives were reached successfully. The results strongly demonstrated that the number of gifted minority elementary students can be increased by using: a) a brief intelligence screener, b) a norm referenced gifted behavior checklist, c) a self-help/social questionnaire with Pk-1st graders, and d) providing inservice training on the characteristics of Black and Hispanic gifted students.

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (x) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

3/17/92 _____

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

The writer of this practicum works in an administrative office in a large metropolitan public school system located in the southeastern United States. Currently, there are 271 open schools and thirteen under construction. In order to facilitate the operation and supervision of the growing number of schools, the district has increased the number of administrative offices (referred to as region offices) from four to six. Within the boundaries of this writer's region, there are approximately 52,000 students in prekindergarten through Grade 12. This is approximately one-sixth of the county's total enrollment, 312,000.

Approximately 10 percent of the children in this region (4,900), are enrolled in an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Program and/or receive a related service such as physical or occupation therapy. One thousand of these students are enrolled in a gifted program and the size of this group is growing rapidly. Presently, they represent the third largest exceptionality among the thirteen designated by the state as eligible to receive special instruction. Enrollment figures for learning disabled and speech/language impaired classes rank among the top two respectively.

The county offers special classes to those with mild handicaps at each school in the region. Students with more serious impairments are served at ESE center schools or in cluster centers. These schools have specialized facilities, as well as medical equipment and personnel. This region has six ESE centers, six EH (emotionally handicapped) clusters, and two SED (severely emotionally handicapped) programs. Students served in ESE centers are those from low incidence exceptionalities. These include the hearing impaired, autistic, moderately to profoundly mentally handicapped, and physically impaired.

Although there are numerous programs for disabled students, there is also a wide selection of programs available to the academically advanced, talented, and intellectually gifted student. Yet, 15 percent of the students residing in this community attend private schools. Many of these students receive speech therapy at their neighborhood public school once or twice a week even though they attend a private school. A large percentage of these children participate in a resource gifted program one or two days a week, an arrangement supported by many of the local private and parochial schools in this area. Others participate in public school offerings only during the summer session.

The ethnic composition of students in this region is 60% Hispanic, 30% Black, and 10% Asian, American Indian, and

White. This district has also received a large number of refugees from Cuba and Nicaragua, a figure which has increased by 41% over the last two years. Most of these children have limited English proficiency (LEP), and many of these students report that they had been unable to attend school or receive proper medical attention in their native countries.

This section of the school district covers a total of 165 square miles. Zoning defines our communities as being composed of two municipalities, one unincorporated neighborhood, and one special taxing district. According to the different chamber of commerce offices, this area is well-known for its manmade lakes and waterways, interstate highways, sports stadium, industrial parks, clothing manufacturing, and the tri-county railroad system.

Many of the families living in this region do not have a permanent address and find it necessary to move frequently during the school year. Also a majority of these families receive public benefits from the government to help care for their children. This is especially helpful for parents of a handicapped child. Elementary schools which serve a large number of students from low-income families (measured by the number of students on free or reduced lunch) receive Chapter I funds to supplement basic skills instruction. Presently 63 percent of the schools in this region qualify for Chapter I funding. Consequently, less than half (37 percent) of the

families in this area are in the middle to high income bracket.

Writer's Work Setting and Role

The area office for Exceptional Student Programs plays an important role in overseeing the delivery of special education and student support services in the region. The administrative staff relies heavily upon the performance of its many employees. This group is referred to as a multidisciplinary team (M-Team) because its members represent specialists from a number of related special education fields. In this region there are 19 school psychologists, 6 staffing specialists, 5 M-Team secretaries, 23 speech therapists, and 13 visiting teachers.

School psychologists are the second largest group of personnel employed by the region office. Their major responsibilities include serving as a member of the Child Study Team (CST), verifying that all referral activities have been completed, evaluating students for possible placement in an ESE program, and reviewing the results of the psychological with parents during staffings.

Staffing specialists, often referred to as placement specialists or LEAs (Local Education Agency) representatives, are also an integral part of the M-Team. Their job involves determining whether a student is eligible for placement in or dismissal from an ESE program, and their signature on an

Individual Education Plan (I.E.P.) and the Consent for Placement form serves as verification to the state Department of Education that a child has met the appropriate eligibility criteria. The LEA designation also allows staffing specialists to sign as the region director of ESE programs when necessary. Their signature is required on many ESE documents, and the absence of the LEA signature can result in a loss of state funding.

Visiting teachers also are members of the M-team. Their primary responsibility involves conducting a structured interview with the parents of children who have been referred for testing. This information is presented in a social history report which is attached to the results of the psychological evaluation. Visiting teachers also administer an adaptive checklist in cases where a child is suspected of being mentally handicapped, autistic, or hearing impaired.

The ESE secretaries perform a variety of jobs, but most importantly they provide clerical assistance to the school psychologists and placement specialists. A majority of their time is spent typing psychologicals. The second most time consuming task involves inputting information about referral activities into the school system's online data base system. These activities include three chronological events a) the date a case is opened, all referral activities have been completed and the case is ready for testing; b) the evaluation date, the day the testing was completed; and c) the date the case was closed, the day the psychologist

signs his/her report signifying the information contained in the report is correct. The remainder of the M-team secretaries' time is spent preparing documents completed during staffings.

This writer serves as the staffing specialist chairperson and the administrative assistant to the Region Director of ESE Programs. Therefore, the assignments delegated to her cover a wide range of areas. However, the primary responsibility of this job involves monitoring program compliance mandated by the Handicapped Children's Act (P. L. 94-142) which was recently renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). This writer also keeps the region director informed about and prepares cases that might need a regional or district staffing, a step which can sometimes eliminate the need for a due process hearing.

Other activities include assisting placement specialists with difficult cases. Sometimes the staffing specialist chairperson must serve as an arbitrator when seeking a placement for a child outside the region or in a joint funded program. Through the use of networking this writer is able to negotiate with teachers, doctors, educational specialists, and administrators for a student's enrollment in a special program. This writer is also responsible for conducting monthly staff meetings. These sessions are used to distribute information about

changes in the ESE procedures, articulation, the opening of new programs, and the allocation of teacher units. The staffing specialist chairperson also serves as a liaison between the public school system and different government agencies. When information about a child's placement in an exceptional program is requested this writer insures the proper forms for an exchange of information have been signed before releasing confidential documents.

This writer also serves as the region chairperson of gifted programs, acting as a link between the district office of Gifted and Allied Programs, the region ESE Department, and the teachers/principals at schools with gifted programs. The primary function of this position is to plan, develop, and implement the middle school gifted summer program. Some of the major responsibilities subsumed under this title include: providing information in response to community and school inquiries, recommending materials and strategies for teachers new to gifted education, providing technical assistance to staff in the development of IEPs, reevaluations, and other documentation required for ESE, and assisting with the development of new programs and recruitment of gifted students.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

This practicum focused on enhancing the procedures used to identify potential elementary gifted minority students in kindergarten through Grade 5. The term "minority" was used to indicate children of Black and Hispanic descent. Because most of these youngsters were also culturally disadvantaged and/or linguistically different, these terms are used interchangeably throughout the proposal.

According to the manual, Special Programs and Procedures for Exceptional Education (1990-91), "the classroom teacher [should] recommend to the principal all students with outstanding academic abilities as indicated by classroom performance, school records, standardized achievement tests, and/or other tests" (p. 138).

Once a child has been nominated for gifted testing, the classroom teacher has the responsibility of preparing the referral packet. Documents that are most often included in the referral packet include the a) report card, b) Standford Achievement Test scores (stanines), and c) two completed gifted behavior checklists.

The screening activities required by this school district represent a relaxing of the criteria used to

identify potential minority gifted students. For example, schools located in lower income communities are currently being told to refer students if they have a) a minimum grade point average of 'B' or better, b) stanines of 6 and above, c) demonstrated a majority of the behaviors as indicated in the county's gifted behavior checklist, and d) are working on or near grade level.

This represents a large departure from the screening standards outlined in A Resource Manual for the Development and Evaluation of Special Programs for Exceptional Students, Volume II-G: Gifted, (1981). The criteria used at that time required that a student have a) stanines of 9 in two or more areas, b) a score of 130 or higher on an informal intelligence test, and c) be observed demonstrating a majority of the behaviors on a standardized gifted behavior checklist.

The county has recently revised its gifted behavior checklist in an attempt to reduce the amount of time required for completion by the teacher. However, a review of its use indicated that it is a poor predictor of a student's potential giftedness. Although the form only contains 23 items, many teachers submit it with many statements unmarked--an issue which is specifically stressed in the directions of other checklists. Some publishers even suggest that if an observer is in doubt about how to respond to an

item, they should consult with another teacher or staff member. Also, it seemed that using a checklist with only four or five items in each subscale does not lend itself to analyzing a student's individual strengths and weaknesses.

Another shortfall of the newly revised gifted rating scale is that it does not include any directions on its usage or any scoring instructions. However, the new format does represent a reduction in length from six to two pages, a feature which substantially reduces the amount of time needed for completion. This checklist is also being used to observe all students regardless of age. In years prior there were gifted checklists for students in kindergarten, Grade 1, the intermediate grades, and in Grades 7-12. Also, because the gifted checklist must be bought from the county's forms department, many low referring schools are still using checklists which were designed in 1979.

Another weakness which can be found in this checklist is that it does not include subscales for at least two of the areas identified in the state and federal definition of gifted, i.e., visual and performing arts and specific academic aptitude. Therefore, one can conclude that this checklist does not meet compliance with state and federal mandates.

This writer also felt that the wording used in many of the statements is poor. For example, many of the behaviors are described in such a general manner that almost all students

could be observed demonstrating that characteristic, e.g., "Is cooperative with teacher and classmates." The items did not appear to have a strong ability to discriminate between giftedness, higher achievers, and good students. On the other hand, many statements appeared to be too technical. For example, few regular classroom teachers are familiar with terms like elaboration, fluency, provocative questions, and cause-effect relationships (Williams, 1979).

Norm referenced achievement test scores, or stanines are also used to identify potential gifted students. Many of the minority students referred for gifted testing had stanines of 6 and 7, or less in one or more subject areas. Stanines below 7 represent academic performance below the 84th percentile. In other words, students with achievement scores below stanine 7 do not represent the top 2% of the population. These students are not performing two standard deviations above the norm, an indicator commonly used to identify potential giftedness. Many teachers referred students who had demonstrated a gain of three stanines from the previous year which was a pattern typically observed when machine scoring can be faulty. In Hillsborough County, Florida "public school officials...pinpointed faulty pencils as the reason a computer misread 10,500 answer sheets for a basic-skills test taken by 85,000 students" (Fetterman, 1986, p. 159).

After two classroom teachers have completed the gifted behavior checklist and the guidance counselor has attached

the student's grades and stanines the Child Study Team (CST) meets to review the information collected. The CST, a group of school professionals which is not limited to, but usually includes the school psychologist, the classroom teacher, an administrator, and the guidance counselor then decides whether or not the student should be referred for a formal evaluation. Consequently, the decisions made by the CST can be best summarized by the phrase, "to test or not to test." Rarely does a Child Study Team recommend that additional information be collected or that a screening instrument be administered. If a child is not going to be administered a psychological evaluation, the process is stopped. Whether a child would benefit from a talented program, honors classes, or advanced instruction in the regular classroom is typically not considered within the domain of the CST.

Sometimes the decision to test a child is made unilaterally by the principal due to parent pressure. These parents often come from middle and high income families. Lately, a large majority of these requests are being made by parents of preschool age and kindergarten students--an age group many educators feel uncomfortable referring for testing.

Unfortunately, most students who are referred to the Child Study Team by the parent or by school staff are tested for giftedness. For example, in one school 41 students were referred and all were tested. This occurs because there is no system for recording and/or evaluating the strengths of

the information collected during the referral process. Hence, the school system has a difficult time justifying to teachers or parents why a child should not be tested.

It would also seem that the changes in the selection criteria used to refer and place gifted students, initially spurred by a rewording of the federal definition of gifted eligibility, have led to much confusion. The Marland Report (1971), a federal status report on gifted education at that time prompted the Gifted and Talented Children's Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-561, section 902). This legislation mandated that students with "...demonstrated or potential abilities [italics added] that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability, or in the performing and visual arts ...require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school" (Congressional Record, 1978). Since the national definition does not stipulate eligibility criteria per se, each state must determine how to measure "potential ability" and establish criteria which can be used to determine whether a student meets criteria for placement in a gifted program. This is a difficult task given the changing demographics of our school population today.

In spite of the changes being implemented to increase the number of minority children referred for gifted testing, a large number of schools in our region have not tested any students in the last year, or have referred less than one

percent of their total school enrollment. These schools have typically been located in low income communities.

An analysis of school enrollment figures suggests that the average elementary school serves approximately 800 students. However, due to overcrowdedness, some schools house 1,000 students or more. As a result of this population increase, it is not unreasonable to expect a school with 1,500 students to refer 30 students (2 percent of the school's total enrollment) for gifted testing.

Findings in a study conducted by Gallagher (1976) indicate that in an "average community the percentage of gifted is 2-4%, but in a superior community it rises to 6-12%" (p.30). This might explain why schools located in middle and upper income communities also refer more students.

Schools in this region which have been found to have a high referral rate in comparison to their school's enrollment generally fall into one of three categories a) they have a gifted program at their school, b) they are preparing to open a gifted program at their site, or c) the majority of the students come from middle class or high income families.

Despite the lack of efficient screening procedures, enrollment in gifted programs continues to increase. However, the percentage of potential gifted minority students meeting eligibility criteria continues to be low. Moreover, if school enrollment figures continue to increase, the cost of administering a full psychological battery to

every student who is referred will become cost prohibitive. Also, the ability to perform such evaluations in a timely manner, usually 90 days, will be impossible. Therefore, this school district needs to enhance the effectiveness, as well as the efficiency, of the instruments and procedures used to identify potential elementary minority students.

Problem Documentation

Existence of the problem in the writer's workplace was substantiated by reviewing monthly generated reports, psychologists' monthly logs, information contained in referral packets, requesting special computerized reports, and conducting interviews with a number of school staff.

The Psychological Services in Process Report (PSPR) was developed by the Department of Student Services to help monitor the progress of cases referred for testing. This report documents the type and amount of activities which have occurred at each site since the beginning of the fiscal school year, July 1st. Each case is classified according to the type of testing being recommended, i.e., a) initial psychological, b) a reevaluation, or c) gifted evaluation. Information regarding each type of referral and its status are reported monthly. The prereferral and referral activities are recorded in the following order: CST date, case opened, case evaluated, case closed, I.E.P./eligibility determined.

The May 1991, PSPR indicated that 22 percent (7) of the elementary schools in the region had not tested any students for placement in a gifted program within the last school year, 19 percent (6) had tested only one to two students, and 12 percent (4) had tested between three to five students. In summary, 53 percent of the schools in the region had tested five students or less during the last school year. The number of referrals in most cases represented less than one percent of a school's total enrollment.

A comparison of referral rates with total school enrollment established that 12 out of 33 elementary schools (36%) in this region refer less than 1 percent of their student population (see Table 1 and Table 2). The ethnic breakdown in all but two of these schools was largely composed of minority students; that is, Black and Hispanic. Only two of the schools exceeded the typical distribution of Asian, American Indian, and White (AIW) students which is 9 percent in this region.

When the number of cases referred were compared with the total school enrollment at high referral sites, it was concluded that in all cases the number of referrals was appropriate. It is interesting to note, however, that two of these five schools have a gifted program on their campus (see Table 2).

Evidence was also collected from the Gifted Analysis Report (GAR), a printout created by the district Department

of Gifted and Allied Programs to help identify schools with a large number of students who are eligible, but are not currently participating in a gifted program. The GAR also identified how many students were determined eligible for a gifted program within the current school year. Both sets of data are presented by grade level and ethnicity. According to the GAR report of January 1991, only 27 out of the 217 elementary students who had been referred had met criteria for placement in a gifted program.

Table 1

Rate of Gifted Testing by Elementary Schools During the 1990-91 School Year

Students Tested	Schools	% Total Schools
0	7	22%
1-2	6	19%
3-5	4	11%
6-7	4	11%
8-10	5	14%
14-17	6	19%
20-30	1	2%
31-40	1	2%
Total:	34	100%

Table 2

A Comparison of Enrollment Figures and Ethnic Distribution at Targeted Schools

Schools	Enrollment	Referred	Blck	Hisp	AIW*
(LOW REFERRING)					
BRWE	751	2 < 1%	85%	13%	2%
BRGE	633	0 < 1%	9%	89%	2%
AMEE	481	1 < 1%	18%	69%	13%
JHNE	108	0 < 1%	24%	83%	3%
LKSE	559	0 < 1%	34%	57%	9%
MMGE	463	0 < 1%	50%	46%	3%
NRTW	695	0 < 1%	3%	89%	8%
OPLK	973	1 < 1%	61%	35%	4%
PNCP	737	1 < 1%	97%	3%	1%
MWLTS	652	0 < 1%	1%	93%	6%
NTHBY	486	2 < 1%	95%	5%	0%
CRLCE	882	0 < 1%	84%	14%	2%
(HIGH REFERRING)					
JLGDE	1053	16 < 2%	26%	44%	31%
MDWLE	1156	39 > 3%	0%	95%	5%
MMLKE*	565	21 > 3%	14%	38%	48%
PLMSPN	812	15 = 2%	13%	44%	43%
RNBPKE*	749	15 = 2%	83%	13%	5%

*Asian, American Indian, and White

These figures indicate that the schools were able to accurately identify gifted students at a rate of 12 percent.

However, figures in the Psychological Services in Process Report of May 1991, showed that 34 percent of the students referred during the school year had been determined eligible for a gifted program. This rate was confirmed in a special production report which listed all cases which had an outcome code of "G", indicating a gifted evaluation had taken place during the 1990-91 school year. Although both sets of data are not totally accurate, they both are impacted by the same variables. That is, the lapse of time that takes place from the time an activity is completed to the time it is entered in the mainframe. There are also indications that a small percentage of the data was incorrectly entered. For example, some schools had entered the wrong outcome code, a classification which indicates the type of testing being recommended.

Therefore, a cross-validation was performed by comparing the activities reported monthly by individual psychologists in their handwritten logs. This writer was then able to conclude that the figures in the PSPR appeared to be the most accurate and did in fact approximate the information recorded in the psychologists' monthly reports. Hence, 34 percent of the students referred for gifted testing met criteria for placement during this school year. When the figures were compared to information stored in a data base called ISIS, the Individual Student Information System, the percentage of students meeting eligibility was somewhat higher, 40 percent, but, there was only a

difference of 6 percentage points. A final attempt to corroborate the data collected was done by counting the number of forms signed for students who were tested and did not meet criteria. As of May 1991, that rate of eligibility was 35 percent. Based upon this information this writer felt it was safe to conclude that approximately 35 percent of those evaluated for placement in a gifted program meet the state's eligibility requirements.

Another concern which was expressed by many school psychologists was the growing number of referrals being submitted for students of preschool age and those in kindergarten. The Services in Process Report did confirm that the number of intermediate students being nominated for gifted testing does indeed outweigh the number of students being referred in Grades K to 1. A tally of referrals by grade level appears below (see Table 3).

Although there is a high rate of referrals for students in Grade 2 and 3, they represent a very small percentage of the total number of students enrolled in gifted programs in this region. An analysis of gifted enrollment figures indicates that there are very few, if any, kindergarten students participating in gifted programs--a figure which is less than 1 percent of the total number of gifted students in Grades K-5. These figures begin to slowly increase starting with 1st graders which

Table 3

An Analysis of Gifted Referral Rates by Grade Level

Grade Level	# Cases	% Total
Kindergarten	9	3%
1	25	11%
2	62	27%
3	59	26%
4	42	18%
5	34	15%
Total:	231	100%

represent 2 percent. The remaining enrollment figures are as follows: 2nd graders-12 percent, 3rd graders-22 percent, 4th graders-26 percent, and 5th graders-37 percent.

Comparing the number of those tested for gifted by grade level with the number of those found eligible leads to the conclusion that the identification of primary students by teachers is poor. However, the rate of kindergarten students meeting eligibility was 80 percent, a figure which is twice as high as the region average for all students meeting criteria. This is plausible, if one realizes that most kindergarten students are referred by their parents, a group which, according to Sattler (1988), is able to accurately identify giftedness. It should also be noted that many of the preschool and kindergarten

referrals were handled through the region office. These parents were scheduled for an oral interview with this writer. Those children who exhibited a majority of the behaviors included on a social history checklist were referred to their homeschool psychologist for testing. Unfortunately, a parent interview was not used with first graders. The rate of eligibility dropped to 41 percent--another indication that training in the identification of primary aged students (K-2) is needed.

Gifted enrollment figures gathered during the 1990-91 school year generally supported the finding that the percentage of Anglos and Asians exceeded their representation in the total school population. That is, three times as many eligible Anglo, Asian, and American Indian (AIW) gifted students (30%) were found attending gifted programs as were Blacks and Hispanics. In this region, AIWs represent less than 10 percent of the population. Hispanics currently comprise 61 percent of the region's total school population; yet, only 40 percent of those enrolled in elementary gifted programs are Hispanic. However, Blacks were represented in gifted programs by a percentage equal to their proportion in the region (30 percent).

A report presented to the School Board by the county's Bureau of Education in 1986 cited the same identification issues as are presented in this practicum. These problems

briefly summarized include: a) problems with the student referral process, b) delays in conducting evaluations, and c) lack of understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity.

An analysis of the IQ scores of students who did not meet criteria for placement also supported the assumption that the current referral procedures do not help identify children who have a high probability of qualifying for a gifted placement. The IQ scores reviewed over a four month period fell into the average range (90-109) 62 percent of the time. Only 26 percent were found to be above average with IQ scores ranging from 110 to 117, and an even smaller percentage (4 percent) scored in the superior range, 118 to 129.

Based on these findings, this writer has concluded that there is strong evidence to support that a problem exists with the procedures currently in use to identify/screen potentially gifted minority elementary students.

Causative Analysis

The identification of minority students, which are typically referred to as 'culturally different and limited English proficient' (LEP) in educational literature is a problem which has increased in intensity due to recent litigation involving P.L. 94-142 (Education for All Handicapped Children's Act) and the META (Multicultural and Educational Training Activities) Consent Decree.
The number of minority students meeting criteria for

placement in a gifted program has been steadily increasing in this county since 1982; however, LEP children are still underrepresented in gifted programs.

According to most studies, there are five factors which contribute to the disproportionate number of minority students identified as gifted. These include: a) the criteria used to determine eligibility, b) the screening process, c) problems in the student referral process, d) lack of understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity, and e) the lack of inservice training.

The reason cited most frequently as being responsible for the low minority student representation of those referred for gifted testing or found eligible is the criteria mandated by the state Department of Education. Unlike the federal definition, the state stipulates that a student must demonstrate superior intellectual development on an individually-administered standardized test of intelligence by receiving an IQ score of 130. Some counties allow students to qualify on a subscale score or score which indicates a student's Estimated Learning Potential (ELP). The latter score is obtained by administering the SOMPA (Survey of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment) (Mercer, 1979) to children under the age of 11 who score between 118 and 127 on the WISC-R.

The state also requires that students exhibit a majority of the characteristics included on a standard scale or checklist, and demonstrate a need for the program.

These standards are rarely monitored and the IQ score is often used as the sole determiner of eligibility.

A second factor which contributes to this problem is the lack of inservice training provided to teachers, psychologists, and administrators. Due to their lack of knowledge about gifted characteristics, educators often refer the wrong type of students. Few teachers understand the difference between high achieving, talented, and gifted students. Unfortunately, many truly gifted students are overlooked.

Teachers who work with culturally disadvantaged and limited English proficient children have expressed the need for training, as well as appropriate screening instruments.

Another factor that seemed to be have a negative affect on the number of minority students referred for gifted testing is the absence of a multidimensional record sheet for entering in assessment information collected during the referral process. It is unfortunate that there is no instrument which can used by the Child Study Team to help evaluate referral information.

There is also a need to increase the type and quality of screening instruments made available to school staff during the referral process. Schools who serve limited English proficient or culturally disadvantaged students need to be provided with appropriate assessment tools. However, even if there were monies available to order screening tests few

schools have the knowledge necessary to order the appropriate materials.

Over the years parents have complained that unless they had requested their child be referred for a gifted evaluation, their child would not have been tested. This is a sensitive issue. Nevertheless, there is some truth in the fact that schools are hesitant to refer children in the lower grades. Also, administrators and teachers of schools without gifted programs do not like the idea that gifted students are absent from the regular classroom one or two days a week.

The final problem that was identified as a contributing factor in the identification of minority students was the lack of understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity by teachers and administrators. Many minority students do not exhibit behaviors and characteristics which are recognized as manifestations of giftedness by the dominant culture. Futhermore, teachers have ambivalent feelings about identifying children who have learning potential, as opposed to those who have demonstrated superior intellectual development. Educators generally agree that many of the gifted checklists in use today may not adequately identify behaviors typically exhibited by gifted children who are culturally disadvantaged, culturally different, or linguistically different. Consequently, schools located in certain areas do

not refer any of their students for a gifted evaluation--a pattern that is often repeated year after year.

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

In many school districts, the procedures and instruments used to refer potential gifted elementary students are neither effective nor efficient at identifying students from culturally different backgrounds, students with handicapping conditions, young children, and girls (Parke, 1989).

Some educators attribute the problem of identifying gifted students to the national definition proposed by S. P. Marland in 1971 (Whitmore, 1985). As a result of the Marland Report (1971), students with potential, as well as those with demonstrated achievement, became eligible for placement in a gifted program. Although Whitmore (1985) supports this change, she contends that the term potential has caused much confusion among educators--particularly in the selection of screening instruments and identification criteria for use with minority, culturally disadvantaged, limited English proficient, and preschool age students. Whitmore (1985) also believes that the problem of accurately identifying children in atypical populations is often the direct result of "ambivalent attitudes, incomplete or inaccurate information about exceptional learners, and a failure to train school personnel..." (p. 47).

Research studies conducted by Passow (1982) also concluded that the public's perception of disadvantaged children often prevents them from being identified for gifted programs. A commonly held belief by many people is that "academically talented learners come from a middle to high socioeconomic background" (VanTassel-Baska, 1989, p. 22) and disadvantaged children are not capable of high academic achievement because of their home situation (Frasier, 1987; Baldwin, 1980; Bernal, 1978). The testimony recorded during The Gifted and Talented Program Study (1984) conducted in Florida also demonstrates that educators are of the opinion that "minority students are not capable of the level of superior intellectual performance required for participation in gifted programs" (p. 3).

Fraiser (1991) agrees that the issue of identifying gifted disadvantaged and culturally diverse students has been and continues to be problematic. She also believes that educators know that gifted children may be found in all cultural groups and at every socioeconomic level, although studies have found that efficient identification attempts have not been successful.

Some educators argue that the problem of identifying minority gifted students is more a problem of how you integrate the information from a set of multiple criteria into the traditional screening and identification process (Frasier, 1984), (Eby, 1983), Baldwin (1980), (Renzuilli, 1981).

Reliance on teacher nominations and the use of IQ cutoff scores has in many cases prevented the identification of these students (Frasier, 1990; Eby, 1983). Abbott (1982) also observed that "examining I.Q. scores for the purpose of identifying giftedness...amounts to viewing intelligence in terms of English fluency" (p. 8), a point often debated in the literature.

The identification and screening of young gifted children from middle and upper class homes is a problem that has also been negatively affected by people's attitudes (Whitmore, 1985; Burns, Mathews, & Mason, 1990; Karnes & Johnson, 1991). Many ask, "Why do more for these children; they already have more than most?" or "Why worry about these young children until they reach the third or fourth grades?" (Karnes & Johnson, p. 267).

Through their research, Karnes & Johnson have been able to identify five barriers which they feel impedes the identification of preschool and primary gifted children. These include "1) the lack of parental advocacy, 2) lack of appropriate teacher training, 3) emphasis on older students among gifted educators, 4) financial constraints, and 5) legal roadblocks" (Karnes & Johnson, 1991, p. 270). However, the biggest reason school administrators give for not supporting a preschool gifted program or testing is because they are not required to do so. Also, if there is a shortage of funds most school systems do not pursue the development of programs that are not mandated.

Burns, Mathews, & Mason, (1990) found that the lack of standardized screening instruments also prevents the identification of gifted children between the ages of 3-5. For example, there are only a few rating scales which can accurately discriminate bright preschoolers from gifted children in this age group.

Another screening device often cited in research studies is the teacher checklist. Studies conducted by Gear (1976) found that "although teacher nominations are used more extensively than any other approach [in identifying gifted], they are successful only about 45 percent of the time" (p. 48). Trentham and Hall (1987) also found that teacher rating scales have limited predictive validity in identifying gifted students.

The use of gifted behavior checklists was not viewed favorably by Fetterman (1986) or Glasnapp, Douglas, Isaac, Hitz, & Carlton (1981). Both men agreed that these instruments are often outdated and lack internal consistency. Glasnapp et al. (1981) also found that the use of teacher ratings as predictors of giftedness was generally nonproductive. Research conducted by Pegnanto and Birch (1959) proved that teachers were able to identify only 45 percent of the gifted children in their junior high classes--a figure which drops to 10 percent for kindergarten teachers (Jacobs, 1971). In a study conducted by Buchanan (1987), the teachers who were the poorest at predicting

giftedness in their students were teachers who had received no special training.

The lack of training among educators often has a negative effect upon the amount of children referred for gifted testing. Clark (1988) found that administrators who are not familiar with identification procedures and available programs often withhold their support of gifted programs. According to a survey conducted by Klaumeirer, Mishra, & Maker (1987), school psychologists also viewed themselves as being poorly trained in the identification of gifted students.

A critical review of the literature reveals that the identification of potential elementary gifted minority students is a multifaceted problem. Reasons which were widely supported by empirical research included a) a lack of training in gifted identification procedures, unfamiliarity with current eligibility criteria, and unfamiliarity with available screening instruments (Clark, 1988; Jacobs, 1971; Klaumeirer, Mishra, & Maker, 1987; Sattler, 1988); b) negative attitudes and perceptions about minority and culturally disadvantaged children (Baldwin, 1980; Bernal, 1978; Fraisier, 1987; Whitmore, 1985); c) the need to identify additional screening instruments which can be used to effectively identify minority gifted students (Glasnap, et al., 1981; Fetterman, 1986; Trentham & Hall, 1987, d) the need to develop a student profile sheet which can be used to record the

information collected during the referral process (Eby, 1983; Fraisier, 1987; Renzuilli, 1981); and e) the need to identify a gifted behavior checklist that is sensitive to the gifted behaviors manifested by minority children (Cummings, 1980, Rezuilli & Reiss, 1981; Glasnapp, et al., 1981).

Other concerns which are strongly documented in the research address issues related to testing children between the age of 3-5 years old and those who have limited English language proficiency (Bernal, 1991; Karnes & Johnson, 1991). Also, studies conducted by Trentham and Hall (1987), Fetterman (1986), and Glasnapp, et al. point out that while the mostly commonly used tool for gifted identification continues to be the teacher checklist, it is one of the most inaccurate. Therefore, it was not surprising to find that the lack of training among educators is the second most commonly cited problem in the literature (Clark, 1988; Jacobs, 1971; Klaumeirer, Mishra, & Maker, 1987). However, using quotas on gifted referrals based on percentages of the total school population in conjunction with a nomination form which uses student behaviors as a sole determiner of gifteness was not widely advocated by researchers (Eby, 1983; Renzuilli, 1981). This process is beneficial in states which do not have legislation regarding gifted eligibility. Presently, 24 states have passed laws permitting appropriations for gifted and talented programs (Harrington,

Harrington, & Karns, 1991) and they must follow state eligibility criteria.

However, everyone agrees that the best reason for pursuing the use of better referral procedures is that it is cost effective. As most administrators are aware, administering individual intelligence tests is expensive (Clark, 1988) and time consuming (Fineman & Carran, 1986; Fischman, 1985; Clark, 1988; Sattler, 1988). Therefore, when teachers refer a large number of students who do not qualify, funds are not being used efficiently or effectively.

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Goals and Expectations

The major goal of this practicum was to demonstrate that enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of screening /referral activities will can lead to an increase of Black and Hispanic elementary students found eligible for placement in a gifted program. A second, but related goal was to increase the understanding of gifted characteristics and their relationship to eligibility by teachers, administrators, and counselors.

Behavioral Objectives

Each of the proposed behavioral objectives were designed to address the problems associated with identifying potentially gifted Black and Hispanic elementary students. The criteria in the following objectives was used to measure whether the primary goals of this practicum had been successfully achieved. These include:

1. Increasing the overall percentage of Black and Hispanic students found eligible for placement in a gifted program by 10 percent in the targeted schools which will be measured after the implementation period by using the Gifted Students Referred with Outcome of G within Region 1.

2. Increasing the number of Black and Hispanic students screened for gifted testing in 80 percent of the low referring schools to 1 percent of their total school enrollment which will be measured after the implementation period by using the Psychological Services in Process Report and monthly logs sheets submitted by each school representative.

3. Increasing the percentage of students screened/ referred for gifted testing in kindergarten through Grade 2 by 10 percent in the targeted schools which will be measured after the implementation period by using the Psychological Services in Process Report.

4. Increasing the understanding of gifted characteristics and eligibility criteria by teachers and counselors to 80 percent which will be measured on an instrument administered after the completion of inservice training.

Measurement of Objectives

In order to show that the anticipated outcomes stated in each of the behavioral objectives have been met, data will be collected from the Analysis of Gifted Report and the Psychological Services in Process Report, two computerized printouts distributed by the Department of Management Information Services (MIS). The information from these reports will also be compared to data collected from

the psychologist's monthly reports due to data entry errors observed in each of the two reports. There was an average discrepancy of 20 percent in the total number of students reported as tested in each of these documents during the 1990-91 school year. Interestingly enough, the secretaries' logbooks confirmed the figures recorded by the school psychologists. The fact that these handwritten reports are free of computer error and are recorded more quickly than data is entered accounts for this agreement. However, data contained in the two computerized reports did provide valid information regarding the ethnicity and grade level of those referred for gifted testing. The Gifted Analysis Report was also used to establish the percentage of students enrolled and the students determined eligible during the 1990-91 school year. This information was broken down into ethnic groups and by grade level.

Between the months of August, 1990 and May 1991, approximately 231 elementary students were tested for gifted. This figure represents the total number of students evaluated by the 34 elementary schools in the region. Only 10 percent of these students were not Hispanic or Black. Approximately 34 percent of minority students in kindergarten through Grade 5 met criteria for placement in a gifted program.

In order to meet the criterion in Objective 1, the combined number of Black and Hispanic students found eligible will have to increase to 44 percent. This was

measured by comparing the number of minority students tested and found eligible in the targeted schools with the number of minority students who were tested and did not meet criteria (DNMC) between the months of September 1991, and February 1992. The latter figure, those who DNMC were defined by the number of Program Recommendation and Consent for Placement forms that were signed by this writer during the interval of time stated above. These figures were cross referenced with data contained in the Psychological Services in Process Report and the Gifted Analysis Report.
If the total number of minority students determined to be eligible for placement in a gifted program has increased by at least 10 percent, than the criterion in Objective 1 will have been satisfied.

Students may be referred for gifted testing any time during the school year. However, the figures cited in the psychologists' monthly reports indicated that more students were referred for gifted testing during the month of October than during any other time of the year, and the number of students tested for gifted doubled during the months of December and January. This increase is due largely to the number of psychologists in the region who are being paid by the public school system to evaluate potential gifted students after school hours. Each psychologist is asked to submit the number of students they would like to test and a contract is issued.

However, a tally of the total number of students tested for gifted at each elementary school showed that as many as 18 schools (56%) had referred less than 2 percent of their total school population. Interestingly enough, there was an equal amount of targeted schools with a predominately Black or Hispanic student membership. At all of the targeted school sites, the percentage of white non-Hispanic students was less than 10 percent which matches their ethnic representation in the total school population in the region.

Only two of the schools identified as having a low referral rate had an equal percentage of Black and Hispanic students. Information about the ethnic distribution in each of the targeted schools (see Table 2) corroborated that all except one of the low referring schools had a predominately minority student population. However, 60 percent of the high referring schools had two to three times more representation by Anglos, Asians, and American Indians.

To satisfy the criterion stated in Objective 2, 80 percent of the targeted schools (10) will have to increase the number of students screened for a gifted evaluation to at least 1% of their total school enrollment. Stating the outcome in these terms allowed the writer to control for the difference in student enrollment at each school which varied from 450 to 1,000. The amount of growth stated in Objective 2 also took into account the number of students already attending a gifted program. A review of enrollment figures found that only one of the targeted schools had a gifted

population that exceeded one percent of the total school's population and four of the 12 schools were sending 1/2 percent of their students to a gifted resource center.

To measure whether the criterion has been met, the writer calculated what 1% of each of the targeted schools' enrollment was based upon the figures reported by the Department of Attendance during the final week in September. Then the total number of Black and Hispanic students referred by each of the targeted schools between the months of September 1991, and February 1992, was compared with the figure identified as representing 1 percent of the school's total enrollment. If 10 of the 12 targeted low referring schools screen the required number of minority students, the criterion for Objective 2 will be satisfied.

The largest number of minority elementary gifted students was in grades 6-8 (273), followed by grades 3-5 (258), and kindergarten-2 (45). Enrollment figures also suggested that the percentage of students referred and tested in kindergarten through Grade 2 represented only 6 percent of the total number of students participating in gifted programs. In order to maximize the development of a gifted child's potential, they must be identified early. To meet the conditions in Objective 3, the total number of students referred for a gifted evaluation in kindergarten-Grade 2 in both high and low referring targeted schools must increase by 10 percent. This was measured by comparing

the total number of students screened in each of the designated grades (K-2) with the total number of students referred at each of the targeted schools between the months of September, 1991 and February, 1992.

Research indicates that there is a direct correlation between the knowledge educators have about the behaviors that characterize gifted students and their ability to accurately identify these students. In order to meet the criterion in Objective 4, a survey was designed to assess the level of understanding educators have of concepts related to the identification and placement of gifted students. Questions about eligibility criteria and terminology used in this county's Procedures for Exceptional Education Programs (1991) and the Gifted Behavior Checklist (1991) were included.

After the survey was approved by the ESE Director, it was distributed to the target school's representatives at the first inservice meeting. At that time, the purpose of this action research project was explained more fully. This instrument also used open ended questions to gather general information about each school's referral history. These questions also allowed for spontaneous answers from the respondents.

The next step involved computing the mean level of correctness for survey items related to gifted characteristics. An item analysis was used to identify which

concepts were misunderstood by the majority of the respondents. Concepts which had been poorly understood by a majority (50 percent or more) of the respondents were covered during the inservice training sessions.

In order to measure the mastery of the criterion in Objective 4, a posttest was designed with fifteen true/false items to assess the effectiveness of the inservice training. This test took no more than ten to fifteen minutes for the participants to complete. If the group's mean score on the posttest is 80 percent or more, then the criterion in Objective 4 will have been met.

Mechanism for Recording Unexpected Events

As in any well-planned project, one must anticipate the unexpected. Therefore, a log and a calendar of adjusted timelines were recorded throughout the implementation period. When unanticipated problems arose, they were shared immediately with the ESE Director. He was given a weekly update on the progress of scheduled activities on the calendar plan. This enabled the writer to make any changes, adjustments, or modifications necessary to carry out the implementation plan within the allotted amount of time.

Description of Plans for Analyzing Results

During the implementation of this practicum proposal a variety of instruments were used to collect data. In Objective 1, the total number of gifted minority students

found eligible in kindergarten through Grade 5 was compared to the total number of students who were evaluated and found to be ineligible during the implementation period. The rate of gifted eligible vs. ineligible was evaluated by comparing the difference between these two figures prior to and at the conclusion of the implementation period. By comparing the rates of eligibility recorded in table form, a determination could be made as to whether or not the criterion in Objective 1 had been met.

Plans to analyze the results in Objective 2 involved comparing the total number of minority students referred in each of the targeted schools during the months of September 1991, through February 1992, with the number equalling 1 percent of that school's total enrollment. Student enrollment figures for each of the targeted schools were established by using the figures reported in the final week of September by the Department of Attendance. In order to establish whether the criterion in Objective 2 has been met, the figures from both sets of data were compared. The results of this analysis will be presented in table form.

Since the early identification of gifted children is a region-wide problem, the number of minority students referred at each school site were not analyzed separately. Also, it has already been established that all but one of the schools targeted for low referral are represented by a majority of minority students. Mastery of this objective,

however, was analyzed by comparing the number of students referred for a gifted evaluation in kindergarten through Grade 2 to the total number of students referred at the other grade levels in the targeted schools. To determine whether the criterion in Objective 3 has been met, the percentage of primary gifted student referrals will have to increase from 7 to 27 percent when compared to the total number of students referred in kindergarten through Grade 5. The data collected in this objective will be presented in table form.

In Objective 4, results from the survey and the posttest instrument were used to record changes in the understanding of gifted characteristics by teachers, counselors, and administrators in the targeted schools. As previously stated, the survey was disseminated to one school representative at each of the targeted schools. The mean level of correctness was computed for each item to establish which concepts were poorly comprehended by the respondents. After the final inservice training, a posttest was administered. In order to meet the criterion identified in Objective 4, the mean standard score on the posttest instrument for each group attending the inservice will have to be 80 or higher.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

The problem of identifying/screening potential gifted minority students in the elementary grades is a problem that has been and continues to be problematic. The fact that minority students are still under represented in gifted programs strongly suggests that identification problems still exist (Frasier, 1991). Many noted educators have suggested that schools need to make a deliberate and concerted effort to identify potential gifted candidates from lower socioeconomic groups (Gowan & Bruch, 1971; Whitmore, 1985; Torrance, 1968; Baldwin, 1987). In a speech made before the National Association of the Gifted, Torrance (1968), projected that "in the future we shall have to depend upon...gifted members of disadvantaged and minority cultures for most of our creative achievements" (p. 132). As early as 1956, Beilin was urging colleges to recruit highly capable students from lower socioeconomic groups.

The number of articles appearing in professional journals also suggests that addressing the needs of children from culturally and linguistically different minority groups is increasing, especially in large urban school districts.

The META Consent Decree (Multicultural Education and Training Activities) (1989) has led to special instruction for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. Changes in instruction and the identification of students for special programs has also been affected by the influx of immigrants from foreign countries. Some public schools have even begun to develop procedures for serving and identifying the gifted immigrant child (Harris, 1991).

Over the last three decades, numerous solutions have been suggested to enhance the referral/screening of gifted minority students. The solutions that are discussed in this section include a) providing staff development and training, b) using checklists and rating scales specifically designed for culturally diverse and disadvantaged populations, c) using a matrix to weight data from multiple sources, and d) modifying assessment procedures.

Although most authors cited recommended one of the five solutions listed above, they all agreed that teacher inservice training was needed. Fetterman (1986) suggests that training in identification and referral procedures should be implemented in schools that have not referred any students to the gifted program.

In a study conducted by Gear (1978), teachers received a training packet and a series of five inservice sessions. Results of this research demonstrated that teachers who participated in the training were twice as effective in

making referrals as those in the control group, and that their referrals were more accurate (Gear, 1978). Both Gear (1978) and Buchanan (1987) agree that during the initial training session teachers should be taught how to recognize the needs and characteristics of gifted and talented children. Borland (1978) also demonstrated that teachers can improve their efficiency in selecting gifted students when they are given a list of specific behaviors to rate.

Sharp (1981) conducted a study in which procedures for identifying minority and LEP students were investigated. A summation of responses recorded during oral interviews revealed that teachers and administrators felt strongly about the need for "testing inservice and intensive dissemination and training in the...state guidelines" (Sharp, 1981, ii). Wallace (1982) provided teacher training in the identification of bilingual students and differentiated instructional strategies. His findings indicate that inservice training increased the accurate identification of Hispanic and non-Hispanic gifted students to 91 percent. Fetterman (1986) even recommends that "teachers with the greatest predicative ability should help conduct inservice training programs" (p. 159).

The research also suggests that inservice training be provided to school counselors (Gowan & Burch, 1971), administrators (Clark, 1988), and psychologists (Sattler, 1988; Samuda, 1975; Kalusmeirer, Mishra, and Maker, 1987).

Another solution offered in the literature is the use of a gifted behavior checklist or rating scale. Although these instruments have proven to be less than an accurate predictor of giftedness, many agree they can provide valuable information to the referral team (Frasier, 1991; Tuttle, et al., 1988. Eby (1983) supports the use of checklists, but offers the following suggestions: a) the items must be clearly understood, b) statements should measure observable behaviors, c) teachers should be involved in its development, and d) the instrument should be able to be completed quickly. Frasier (1989), another advocate of the checklist, found that stating traits in a dynamic as opposed to a static manner increases the number of minority children identified. She uses the term static to refer to assessments which are in a test form. In a study conducted by Hazendar & Chissom (1981), disadvantaged students were found to display a variety of linguistic disabilities such as limited vocabularies and nonstandard grammar. For this reason it is important to develop identification strategies which are not language dependent (Renzulli, 1973).

Eby (1983) and Frasier (1989) also suggest getting parents and other representatives from the community involved in the rewording of rating scale items can help educators "more accurately reveal the manifestations of giftedness within a cultural group" (Frasier, 1989, p.16-17).

Richert (1985) also found the use of rating scales, checklists, and/or nominations helpful if certain standards are met. He recommends that checklists should a) be based upon research, b) include "negative or unexpected characteristics...", and 3) "emphasize finding information that will complement rather than confirm test-data" (Richert, 1985, p. 71). However, Glasnapp, et al. (1981), found that there was only one item on the checklist that was able to discriminate between gifted and non-gifted high achievers. This question asked teachers to categorize the students being evaluated as,

a) academically gifted (capacity for superior mental functioning),
b) a high achiever with high ability, but not academically gifted,
c) a high achiever with average to above average ability, but who works extremely hard,
d) none of the above (Glasnapp, et al. 1981, p. 18).

Several researchers have pointed out that the use of checklists sensitive to the identification of culturally disadvantaged and culturally diverse students will increase the number of students nominated for gifted testing. The Cummings Checklist of Characteristics of Gifted and Talented (CC) was developed to reflect the learning/ behavioral styles of gifted and talented children, as well as the characteristics of minority students (Cummings, 1980). The use of discriminant analysis found that from 12 to 18 of the 31 items on the CC were able to differentiate between gifted and non-gifted students. As a result of field testing, the author was also able to

conclude that "when used as a supplement to traditional assessment methods, [the CC] increases the proportional representation of culturally different/educationally disadvantaged students among those who are identified as gifted" (p. 11). Over a period of five years, Cummings found that when the CC was used with other traditional assessments the accuracy of identification increased from 30 to 68 percent.

Another approach which has been credited with the ability to increase the number of minority children referred for gifted testing is the matrix. These instruments allow the referral team to record information on a variety of general selection criteria. The next step involves assigning weighted scores to each piece of data. The weighting given to individual scores usually is from 1 to 5. The lower the score, the lower the weighting. In order for the scoring to work, all assessment information must be converted to standard scores. The referral team then records each score in the appropriate column. The number of assessment items marked in each column is tallied, and then multiplied by the correct weighting factor. The sum of the weighted scores yields a total score. In most cases, a school will use a cutoff score which will ensure that 3-5 percent of the student population will be tested and/or placed in, a gifted program.

Screening items most often included on matrixes are standardized achievement scores, grade point average,

teacher recommendations/checklist, parent rating scale, and informal intelligence tests. Some matrixes record achievement scores in subject area, as well as the composite score. The Baldwin Matrix (1984) has twelve assessment items. This is achieved by recording each subscale score on the Renzuilli-Hartman (1971) Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students. Baldwin also uses scores from pyschomotor skills assessments and peer nominations.

Matrixes can become a valuable tool in the identification of minority gifted children. However, some educators are opposed to them because they use cut-off scores and/or weighting systems (Frasier, 1987, 1991).

Richert (1982) cautions that sometimes using multiple criteria matrixes results in the unsound statistical combination of scores. Frasier (1991), who opposes cut-off scores, has adapted the matrix idea by developing a student talent assessment profile (F-TAP). She reports that this instrument can be used to "locate gifted children from diverse cultural backgrounds in a manner which does not erode quality, require excessive data collection or excessive expenditures of time" (p. 239).

The Frasier Talent Assessment Profile (F-TAP) (1991), has five scales: academic, creativity, the arts, leadership, and motivation. Points on these scales are aligned so that data from different sources can be viewed in relationship to each other. It would seem this process differs little from

those used in most matrixes, except no cutoff score is used. Another drawback to using the F-TAP is that no directions are included for the user. However, the inclusion of an "educational planning" section did seem well thought out. This section provides space for recommendations about placement in other programs, curriculum modifications, or involvement in counseling.

The fourth strategy which was examined was the case study. This strategy has also been used to enhance the referral/screening procedures. This approach is similar to the matrix, although the assessment items are not evaluated on a scale. Another difference between the case study approach and the matrix is that when using the case study approach, referral information is reviewed on two levels. The first level involves the referral or nomination of students, and the second involves administering screening instruments. Case studies are known for being sensitive to the learning style of the student and for being cost effective because of the many types of assessment items used (Vassar, 1979). Renzuilli, Reiss, & Smith (1981) have also shown that the case study approach can increase the identification of gifted minority students. Tuttle et al. (1988) remarks that most people do not find it difficult to believe use of the case study is more cost effective, but are surprised to find it is also more efficient.

Another advantage of the case study approach is that it allows educators to expand upon the type of assessment tools

used to gather data. Buchanan (1987) has found that the most effective identifiers of potential giftedness were group achievement tests and group IQ tests. While many agree that screening instruments are the most dependable identification procedures (Ketchum, 1976), others caution about using too high of a cutoff score. In Florida, the state Department of Education recommends that each school district needs to develop:

> specific screening practices to encourage nondiscriminatory and uniform review of existing data (e.g., background information, teacher/parents ratings, achievement test totals or subtest scores, grades in specific academic subjects, previous accomplishments, etc. (Gifted and Talented Program Study, 1984, p. 6).

There is also wide confirmation in the literature to support the use of parents' reports/rating scales for preschool and kindergarten students to estimate the degree of intellectual precocity (Robinson, Roedel, & Jackson, 1980; Clark, 1988; Burns, Mathews, & Mason, 1990). Early childhood experts also recommend the use of screening instruments which include nonverbal assessment. Performance tests cited by researchers include: Standard Progressive Matrices, K-ABC, and Cartoon Conversation Scales. Bernal (1978), Ortiz & Gonzalez (1989) concur that the use of nonverbal instruments increases the identification of Hispanic students.

The use of quota systems is another solution which has been used to encourage the increased identification

of minority students. In the study conducted by LeRose (1978), a quota system was used to control the numbers of white and minority students screened for placement. While Hewrsberger & Asher (1980) agree educationally with the decision to use quota systems, they are concerned with how the students to be tested are chosen.

Listed below are some strategies which might also enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of procedures used to identify gifted minority students, even though they have not been documented by research. They include:

1) Having lead teachers of the gifted assist Child Study Teams in the identification of minority students at low referring schools.
2) Providing a video tape and training materials to schools which may be used individually or in small groups.
3) Holding a one day conference on referral, identification, and placement procedures for interested parents.

Description and Justification for Solution Selected

Each of the solutions found in the literature has features which would most likely lead to an increase in the identification of minority (Black and Hispanic) elementary students. However, many of these strategies do not take into account the cost of implementing expensive screening instruments and the time required

to train people. Other recommendations deemphasize the value of locally developed and normed screening instruments, as opposed to the use of test data (Kirschenbaum, 1983; Glasnapp, et al. 1981).

Therefore, this writer has chosen to implement and locally norm a variety of instruments that can be incorporated into a case study approach. During the second phase of implementation a training component will be provided to instruct teachers, counselors, and administrators in the use of these referral instruments and in the nature and characteristics of gifted students.

During the first months of implementation an effort was made to develop a general selection matrix and to establish an appropriate cutoff score (see Appendix A). This instrument incorporates items which have been documented by research as being good predictors of giftedness: group achievement tests, grade point average, gifted observation checklist completed by the parent/teacher, and IQ scores from screening instruments (Baldwin, 1978; Frasier, 1991; Eby, 1983). After randomly selecting gifted classes from each of the available delivery systems--a) full-time, b) part-time, and c) magnet programs, 25 students were selected for evaluation with Kaufman's Brief Intelligence Test (K-BIT) (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1990), the Gifted Evaluation Scale (GES) (McCartney, 1987), and the Self-Help/ Social Profile Questionnaire, (Harrison, Sparrow, & Cicchetti, 1990) published by the American Guidance Service was administered

to students in kindergarten through Grade 1. The results helped establish appropriate cutoff scores which were used during screening.

The matrix also included an educational planning section (Fraiser, 1991) which listed six different recommendations. These suggestions were designed to enhance a child's educational program by providing a variety of curriculum modifications and student support services. Therefore, if a student was not recommended for a gifted evaluation, he/she could be referred to a program to address his/her strength areas.

The second goal of this practicum was to implement a gifted behavior checklist which has internal consistency and is equally effective in identifying minority elementary gifted students. Therefore, the GES was piloted by classroom teachers and teachers of the gifted. The Cummings Checklist was also piloted for use as a parent rating scale and a prescreening instrument. Both instruments have been field tested and have proven to be effective for identification of minority students. The instructions on both checklists are clearly written and the items are easy to understand. Furthermore, the GES is also reported as having an internal consistency of .90 for the total scale and test-retest reliability yielded correlation coefficients exceeding .91 for each of the five subscales. The inter-rater reliability for the subscales ranged from .91 to .93 for all age levels.

Therefore, it was determined that the GES was a good choice for use as a rating scale in this practicum.

Another concern which is related to the use of rating scales is the use of parent interview forms and/or rating scales which can be effectively used to screen young gifted children between the ages of four (preschool) and second grade. Research indicates that parents of young gifted children are better able to identify giftedness than teachers (Clark, 1988). Therefore, using a parent checklist that can be scored will provide additional information that will help the CST make an educated decision about whether to administer an individual test of intelligence. After a meeting with the Department Chairperson of School Psychologists the Self-Help/Social Profile, a questionnaire, completed by the child's parent, teacher, or day care provider was selected. It was chosen because it assesses behaviors that are relevant to primary students being successful in a gifted program. On this instrument a child's performance in the areas of communication, daily living skills, socialization, and motor skills are evaluated on a scale of 0 to 2. A score of 2 indicates a child is doing the indicated behavior always or almost always, a score of 0 indicates a child never or almost never demonstrates a behavior. Another advantage to using this screening device is that is can be completed in ten minutes or less. Studies conducted over a two year period by Harrison, Kaufman, Bruininks, et al. (1987)

indicated that the construct validity was .93 or better, while the test-retest reliability was .81. It should also be noted that the standard deviation for students ages 4-6 years old was between 2.2 to 2.5 points when the instrument was completed by the parent. Another strong characteristic of this survey is its scoring system which provides corresponding standard scores for converting the screening index, a score which is the result of converting the sum of total scores. The screening index is a composite score from 1 to 6 which reflects the total sum of points acquired on each of the subtests: communication, daily living skills, socialization, and motor skills. A score of 1 represents standard scores of 70 or below, a high score of 6 represents standard scores of 131 and above. This screening device was used on all preschool intakes for potential giftedness and by school counselors during the screening of kindergarten and first graders. Results concluded that an index score of 5 and 6 correlated well with an IQ score of 120 or higher on the K-BIT, a brief intelligence test.

A second meeting was held with the Department Chairperson of School Psychologists to discuss the use of appropriate intelligence screening instruments by low referring and high referring schools. Issues of cost, time required for administration, training, and sensitivity to minority children were assessed. Based upon this meeting and a planning session held with the representative of

the American Guidance Service, the K-BIT was selected. This instrument does not require special training to administer, is administered individually, and only requires 15-25 minutes depending upon a child's age. Individual subtests include expressive vocabulary, definitions, and matrices (a performance test). Another advantage to using the K-BIT is that it allows for teaching during the administration of the test, a feature strongly recommended when testing limited English proficient students and young students (Bernal, 1978). The K-BIT was developed in conjunction with the Cognitive/Language Profile included in the AGS Early Screening Profiles (Harrison et al., 1990; Kaufman & Kaufman, 1990) for ages 2 to 6. Therefore, this test was determined to be an effective screening instrument for young gifted children. It should also be noted that the normative sample was based on demographic information from the 1990 Census figures. The developers of the K-BIT report that test items that appeared to be biased towards gender or ethnicity were eliminated. Test-retest reliability coefficients were also impressive, ranging from .83 to .96.

Inservice training was provided during the second phase of implementation. Prior to designing the training sessions, a survey was distributed to school representatives at each of the targeted schools during the first meeting (see Appendix B). The survey addressed concepts germane to gifted characteristics, state eligibility criteria, use of available screening instruments, and implementation of the

gifted behavior checklists and parent interview/rating scales. Results of the preassessment instrument helped this writer identify which concepts needed to be addressed during the workshops offered to teachers. Issues related to the identification of culturally disadvantaged and linguistically different students were also covered.

Training sessions were held for half a day, once a month from August to November 1991. Due to the number of schools identified, schools were divided by feeder pattern, a clustering system which groups schools by articulation patterns. This reduced the number of participants in each session to 20 or less. Although most of the personnel being trained were school guidance counselors, there were three psychologists, two assistant principals, two gifted teachers, and three academic excellence teachers.

Inservice training provided each school representative with the skills necessary to administer each of the selected screening instruments. These included: the K-BIT, the GES, and the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire.

During the implementation period it was the responsibility of the school contact to administer each of the screening instruments prior to referring students for a gifted evaluation.

During the final three months of the project, principals in the targeted schools were asked to schedule a faculty inservice. A pretest was administered to all

participants and after the presentation an assessment instrument was used to measure understanding of gifted characteristics (see Appendix C). The participants were given materials to help them refer students for the screening program being implemented.

Report of Action Taken

Once the practicum proposal had been approved, the following activities were implemented.

During the first month, much time was spent becoming familiar with the screening instruments to be implemented and reviewing baseline data. Low referring schools, those which had been documented as testing less than one percent of their total school enrollment during the previous school year, were targeted to participate in this pilot screening program. The second group of targeted schools was catagorized as "high referring" sites, having tested two percent or more of their students. In the months prior to the implementation of the screening instruments by the targeted schools, the writer used the Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information (see Appendix A) to score referral packets for students who had not met criteria for placement in a gifted program. After analyzing 75 cases, this writer established that students needed to score a 3.0 on this matrix of screening information prior to being referred for gifted testing. The matrix also helped establish that the

truest indicator of potential giftedness was the brief intelligence score and stanines.

Based upon these findings, a meeting was held with the publisher of American Guidance Service. Dates were set for conducting inservice training for the K-BIT and the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire. Prior to purchasing the identified screening materials, the writer submitted a research proposal to the publisher. This enabled the public school system to receive a 50 percent discount on the materials. Once the proposal was approved, 24 K-BIT kits were ordered.

Use of the matrix also led to the conclusion that a gifted behavior checklist which was norm referenced and provided standard scores was needed. After a review of current rating scales, a second proposal was submitted to Hawthorne Educational Services. Fifteen scoring manuals and 350 copies of the GES were requested. This proposal was also approved and the materials were furnished free of charge.

The latter part of the first month was used to secure permission to offer professional inservice points (PIP) to those who attended the four workshops. After it was learned that participants had to attend 10 hours of training and that the proper forms needed to be submitted to the Teacher Education Center (TEC), a packet was prepared for approval by region administrators. Although the same arrangements could have been made to provide administrators with PIP credits, this course of action was not pursued due to the

low number of school site administrators involved in the project. This idea will be revisited during the 1992-93 school year.

During the second month of implementation the writer spent time preparing the inservice materials, identifying dates for inservice training, sending correspondence to the targeted schools, and becoming more familiar with the identified screening materials.

From August to November 1991, the writer met monthly with the targeted schools. Inservice training was provided in the use of the K-BIT, the Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information, the Self-Help/Social Questionnaire, Cummings Checklist, and the Gifted Evaluation Scale (GES), and characteristics of gifted minority children.

After the second workshop in September 1991, this writer provided assistance to each of the targeted schools based upon their individual needs. The type of services provided included: administering the different screening instruments (9 schools), scoring the results of the screening (9 schools), meeting with the parents of students who were not going to be referred for a gifted evaluation based upon their screening scores (done at 2 schools), and conducting faculty inservice workshops (3 schools).

When implementing a project of this type, it should be noted whether a school has a guidance counselor or someone who will be released to administer the screening

instruments. In some cases the schools sent one person to the training sessions, but that person was replaced later on in the project. This required that inservice training be provided on an individual basis to another person. Also, many of the schools appointed a representative to attend the training, but that person later reported not having the time to administer the screening instruments or being uncomfortable with being an evaluator. When this occurred, this writer administered the screening instruments. In many cases the counselor, administrator, or gifted teacher would observe. After this type of involvement administrators and counselors usually became more motivated to begin the referral process; they especially felt more confident about giving the K-BIT.

After each student was screened, the instruments were scored, and the results were shared with the school counselor and the referring teacher. It seemed that discussing the results of each student with the teacher and the counselor increased their ability to accurately refer students for screening.

At the end of each month, the representative at each school submitted a log sheet (see Appendix D). This instrument allowed the writer to review the number of potential gifted minority students being screened at each grade level. The form also allowed for feedback which assisted in the reordering of test protocols and extra gifted rating scales.

Emphasis was also placed on the early identification of students between the ages of four and six years-old. Most prekindergarten students were screened by this writer at the region office. This appeared to be the most efficient method since these students were not enrolled in the public school system and appointments had to be made with the parents. Also, these referrals required that the Self-Help/Social Profile be completed by the parent and that took additional time to administer and score. In many cases, the questionnaire had to be translated for the parent.

Although the plan of action included a workshop for teachers of the gifted and possibly some release time to assist in the project, there was not enough time to implement this. However, the number of gifted and academic excellence teachers involved in the project did increase over time.

During the final month of February 1992, special service requests were made for two specialized batch reports. One of these, the Gifted Analysis Report provided a printout of all students currently enrolled in a gifted program, by school, grade, and ethnicity. The second report, Gifted Students Referred with Outcome of G within Region 1, provided a listing of all students who had been tested for gifted within the 1991-92 school year and their IQ scores. This provided the information necessary to analyze the number of gifted referrals, number of students meeting

eligibility, in addition to the percentage region-wide who did no meet criteria in the targeted elementary schools. This information was cross validated by comparing the data in the Psychological Services in Process Report (PSPR) with two special batch reports. The PSPR lists by school each child who has been reviewed by the CST and identifies its stage in the referral process.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

Identifying gifted elementary minority students is an issue that has been and continues to be problematic (Frasier, 1991). In order to gain a better understanding of the issues surrounding this problem in this school district, information was collected from the survey questions, three different computer generated region reports, interviews with school site administrators and psychologists, and a review of gifted referral packets submitted to the region from January to June 1991.

According to the results, it appeared that there were five underlying conditions which were impeding the identification of gifted elementary minority students. These included: a) a lack of training on characteristics of gifted children, b) negative attitudes and perceptions about minority, culturally disadvantaged, limited English proficient, and young gifted children, c) unfamiliarity with state eligibility criteria, d) the use of poor screening instruments, and e) the need to assess the strength of information collected during the referral process. These problems were repeatedly cited in the literature, and although there were a variety of solutions offered, they

basically fell into three categories. The most common strategy offered was inservice training in identification methods and the nature of gifted children. Many also suggested the use of standardized screening instruments, e.g., gifted behavior checklists, brief IQ tests, and achievement tests. The least referenced strategy was the gifted characteristics matrix, such as the one designed by Baldwin (1984).

Based upon the studies presented in the literature, this writer chose to provide inservice training to each of the targeted schools in addition to implementing the use of three standardized screening instruments: the K-BIT, the GES, and the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire. The Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information was used to evaluate the strength of the scores on the selected screening indicators.

The goal of Objective 1 was to increase by 10 percent the percentage of Black and Hispanic students found eligible for placement in a gifted program by the targeted schools. Targeted schools were divided into two groups. One group of school sites had referred less than one percent of their school's total population. The second group had referred two percent or more of their students.

The number of students meeting eligibility criteria in each of the targeted schools was monitored monthly by using the Psychological Inservices Report from September 1991, to

February 1992. At the end of the implementation period, two special batch reports were requested to confirm the data already collected. One of these is called the Gifted Analysis Report. Information in this report includes the total number of students currently enrolled and those eligible and not participating in a gifted program for each school in the region. The number of gifted students at each school are also analyzed according to grade placement and ethnicity. Figures regarding the number of students found eligible within the current school year are also provided. The Gifted Students Referred with an Outcome of G in Region 1 Report, created by this writer, reported the number of students who had been referred for a gifted evaluation during the 1991-92 school year, dates when each stage of the referral process took place, and IQ scores if a student had been evaluated.

In order to assess whether the criterion in Objective 1 was achieved, the following steps were taken. First, the total number of minority students tested at each of the targeted schools was counted. Then this figure was divided by the total number students who were found to be gifted according to established eligibility criteria.

An analysis of the cases already tested for gifted in each of the targeted schools revealed that of the 34 students tested, 27 had met eligibility. That is, 80 percent of the minority elementary students referred after screening by the targeted schools were found eligible for placement

in a gifted program. This represents a gain of 46 percent over the rate of eligibility calculated (34 percent) calculated for this region (see Table 4--Rate of Gifted Eligiblity Prior to Implementation). Therefore, one can

Table 4

Rate of Gifted Eligibility Prior to Implementation

Percent Eligible	Schools
0%	9
5-10%	1
11-20%	5
21-30%	6
31-40%	1
41-50%	8
51-60%	2

conclude that the criterion in Objective 1 was satisfied. Table 5, Number of Minority Students Tested and Found Eligible for a Gifted Program summarizes these results in more detail.

Another outcome which ocurred in part due to this project was the increase of minority students found eligible and enrolled in gifted programs. At the time of this report, representation by minority students in kindergarten-Grade 6 was as follows: a) the percentage of Black gifted students

had increased from 30 percent to 40 percent and b) the percentage of Hispanic gifted students had increased from 40 percent to 45 percent. Consequently, the percentage of AIW decreased from 30 percent to 15 percent.

The aim of Objective 2 was to increase the number of Black and Hispanic students screened for gifted testing in 80 percent of the low referring schools to one percent of their total school population. Enrollment figures released by the attendance department at the end of September 1991, were used to establish the criterion for each school. After the eighth month of implementation, the total number of

Table 5

Number of Minority Students Tested and Found Eligible for a Gifted Program

ETHNITICITY	TESTED	ELIGIBLE
Black	6	3
Hispanic	28	24
TOTALS:	34	27

minority students screened at each site was tabulated. These figures were rounded to the nearest tenth. According to the results, 83 percent of the low referring schools had conducted the prescribed prereferral activities, with at least one percent of their students. Therefore, the

least one percent of their students. Therefore, the criterion in Objective 2 was successfully met (see Table 6).

Table 6

Comparison of Students Screened for Gifted with Total School Enrollment Figures in Low Referring Schools

LOW REFERRAL SCHOOLS	TOTAL ENROLLMENT	1% TSP*	STUDENTS SCREENED	PERCENTAGE TESTED
BRNTWD	939	9	23	2.5%
BRGHT	1035	10	13	1.3%
CRLCTY	1021	10	10	1.0%
MGRDNS	516	5	8	1.6%
NTWNLKS	758	7	7	1.0%
OPLCKA	960	10	5	0.5%
PNCANA	798	8	29	4.0%
PLMSPR	893	9	3	0.3%
LKSTVNS	662	6	16	2.4%
MWLTRS	777	7	7	1.0%
NBYNG	543	5	5	1.0%
JHNSN	175	2	7	4.0%
TOTALS:	9077	88	132	1.5%

*TSP=Total School Population

The emphasis in Objective 3 was to increase the percentage of young (Pk-Grade 2) minority students being screened for a possible gifted evaluation by 10 percent

in both high and low referring schools in comparison to the number referred in the previous school year. Inservice training, a brief intelligence test designed for use with students as young as 4 years old (K-BIT), and the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire which was standardized for use with parents of children from 2 to 6 years old, were used. This instrument was also normed for use by classroom teachers. During the 8 months of implementation, 48 percent, or 66 of the 138 students screened were between the ages of 4 to 7 years old (see Table 7). Since this

Table 7

Comparison of Gifted Referrals by Grade Level and Year

GRADE LEVEL	STUDENTS SCREENED		% OF TOTAL	
	1990-91	1991-92	1990-91	1991-92
PK	0	3	0%	2%
KG	0	22	0%	14%
01	5	25	12%	16%
02	10	34	25%	25%
03	8	40	20%	29%
04	12	19	30%	14%
05	5	13	13%	9%
TOTALS:	37	156	100%	100%

percentage represents a ten percent increase over last year, the criterion in Objective 3 was met. An analysis

of the cases screened for potential giftedness is presented in Table 7: Comparison of Gifted Referrals by Grade Level and Year.

The purpose of Objective 4 was to increase the mean score to 80 percent on an assessment instrument designed to measure the understanding of gifted characteristics and eligibility criteria by teachers and counselors chosen to represent their schools in this pilot gifted screening project. Staff from each of the targeted schools were involved in ten hours of inservice training. Two of the sessions were dedicated to test administration and the use of the matrix of gifted criteria designed by this writer. The latter two workshops involved the examination of classroom techniques designed to enhance the observation of gifted behaviors and discussing characteristics commonly found in culturally disadvantaged, preschool aged children, and LEP students.

Prior to the inservice training, all designated school representatives were given a Survey of Gifted Identification Procedures and Practices which included fifteen true/false items on the characteristics of giftedness (see Appendix B). The results from these survey tools were used to help structure the inservice training sessions. Concepts which were missed by 50 percent or more of the participants on the survey were as follows: a) Everyone is gifted in some way, b) Teachers are better at identifying giftedness than a child's peers or parents, c) Gifted children often challenge

the authority of the teacher and are disruptive and/or disrespectful, d) Commonly used sequences of learning are often inappropriate and can be damaging to gifted learners, e) Some gifted children may perform poorly or even fail subjects in which they are bored or unmotivated, and f) If not challenged, gifted children can waste their ability and become mediocre, average learners.

After the inservice training was completed, an assessment was administered to all the participants. This test included 15 true/false questions. At some schools, handout 1-A, Fact and Fiction about Giftedness (Karnes, 1987) was used. It is part of a kit entitled, For Parents and Teachers of Gifted and Talented Children (Karnes, 1987) published by the American Guidance Service. Since the combined group mean score on both posttests was 95%, the criterion in Objective 4 was met (see Table 8).

Table 8

Comparison of Gifted Identification Test Scores Before and After Inservice Training

	PERFORMANCE SCORES		
	Mean	Median	Mode
Pretest	65	70	75
Posttest	95	90	100

Discussion

The results achieved during this practicum strongly demonstrated that the number of gifted minority elementary students can be increased by using standardized instruments during the prereferral stage. These screening instruments also have demonstrated that they are sensitive enough to help identify atypical gifted children, such as the culturally disadvantaged, young children (Pk-1st), and LEP students when combined with inservice training.

The purpose of Objective 1 was to increase the percentage of Black and Hispanic students found eligible for placement in a gifted program. In order to establish an appropriate level of accuracy, an analysis was done using computer printouts in addition to a review of the cases of students who were tested and did not meet criteria. The data indicated that high referral schools those referring 2 percent or more of their students regardless of the number of students enrolled in a gifted program, were poor predictors of giftedness. For example, one of the high referring schools had 11 gifted students participating in a program, but referred 41 students during the 1990-91 school year, and only 11 students qualified (27 percent). During the 1991-92 school year, the number of referrals from that school had decreased to 5, 4 of those students qualified. The rate of students found eligible had increased to 80 percent. This pattern was also repeated in another high

referring school. At that site, 9 students were referred in 1990-91, but only 2 (22 percent) had met eligibility criteria. During the following year, this same school had increased their accuracy in identification to 100 percent.

Despite the categorization of schools as "high" or "low referring", only 9 schools (26 percent) surpassed the region-wide rate of eligibility of 34 percent prior to the implementation of this screening program. At another 9 locations, not even one student had met eligibility among those who had been tested. However, the majority of the schools (17 or 49 percent) were only able to accurately identify students 10 to 27 percent of the time.

Unfortunately, not all the students who had been screened and referred by the targeted schools have been evaluated at this time. However, the results thus far indicate that using more reliable and valid screening instruments justifies the increase made from 34 to 80 percent in the percentage of students found eligible for placement in a gifted program.

Using a prereferral system to screen potential gifted students has been proven to be an effective intervention for increasing the percentage of students found eligible for a gifted program (Hartsough, Elias, & Wheeler, 1983; Ketchum, 1976; Sharp, 1981). Karnes & Oehler (1986) write "it has become necessary for school districts to employ such a measure in the identification process for these high-ability students" (p.208). In fact, early childhood experts also

recommend the use of screening instruments, especially those which include nonverbal assessment (Burns, Mathews, & Mason, 1990). Bernal (1978), Ortiz & Gonzalez (1989) concur that using nonverbal screening instruments also increases the identification of Hispanic students. Studies pertaining to the identification of Black students do not indicate whether the use of verbal screening instruments, (such as the Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT) (Armstrong, & Jensen, 1981) or performance tests, (such as the Raven's Progressive Matrices (Raven, Court, & Raven, 1983) are better at identifying these students. Currently there is no available independent research regarding the efficacy of brief IQ tests (such as the K-BIT (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1990) which includes both verbal and performance subscales to identify minority students. Educators, such as Baldwin (1984, 1987) and Frasier (1989) favor a case study approach in which a matrix is used to evaluate a number of variables using a weighted system to convert each criteria, viz., grades, achievement scores, teacher rating scales, and IQ scores.

The Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information, which was based upon the concept of the matrix developed by Baldwin (1984), was used in conjunction with the standardized screening instruments to assist CSTs in their recommendation to have a child evaluated formally. Included in the design of this gifted characteristics matrix were index scores, ranging from 1 to 5. Subscales were indicated for each

instrument so that the raw scores could be converted to percentiles or standard scores which matched up with each of the index scores, a method which is advocated by Baldwin (1984, 1987). Because Fraisier (1987, 1991) had suggested that cutoff scores or weighting systems not be used, this writer developed a system whereby the resulting scores are averaged. This allowed for the comparison of data from many instruments without weighting any individual piece of information more than another. The use of this instrument with 75 cases in which students did not meet criteria for a gifted program found that an average of 3.0 seemed to be sensitive enough to discriminate over 90 percent of those who would not be found eligible if tested formally. Another component of the Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information was its inclusion of a recommendation sheet. Those students not found to be good candidates for further testing could be recommended for other programs or services, an idea gleaned from Fraiser's (1991) student talent assessment profile (F-TAP).

One of the instruments used during the screening program was the GES, a standardized gifted rating scale. This instrument was used because not only did it address each of the areas of giftedness in the federal definition, but it made provisions for converting each subscale score into a standard score, percentile, and intelligence quotient. The ability to convert raw scores into percentiles provided this writer with the ability to compare scores from different

screening instruments. Also, the GES provided teachers with a vehicle for objective reporting of gifted behavior patterns.

Eby (1983) lists four criteria by which checklists and rating scales should be judged. According to her studies, the GES meets three of these requirements: a) items are clearly understood, b) statements measure observable behaviors, and c) the instrument can be completed quickly. She also suggests that teachers be involved in the development of a rating scale; this is not possible with the GES.

Another strong characteristic of the GES is that it "emphasized finding information that will complement rather than confirm test-data" (Richert, 1985, p. 71). Efforts such as these, which present a better method of documenting the identification of gifted students, are widely advocated in the literature (Alvino, McDonnel, & Richert, 1981; Renzuilli & Smith, 1977; Robinson, Roedell, & Jackson, 1979; Taylor, 1978).

The goal of Objective 2 was to increase the number of Black and Hispanic children being screened for a gifted program. Schools targeted to participate in this pilot screening program were selected because in the previous year they had referred less than 1 percent of their school's total population. A review of district computer printouts found that of the 34 elementary schools in the region, 8 (24%) had

made no gifted referrals during the 1990-91 school year and 4 schools had referred less than 1/2 percent of their total school population.

Of the 12 low referring schools selected, 11 had a student body represented by predominately Black or Hispanic students. In three of these schools, there was a large population of LEP children who were screened. The use of a performance subtest to screen for giftedness became very useful. Many of these children were referred for further testing based upon this score, confirming the research done by Bernal (1978). In fact, Barkan & Bernal (1991) urge educators of the gifted to use procedures that "increase reliability and validity, such as individually administered IQ tests and multiple screenings" (p. 144). It is this writer's opinion that because the screening instruments selected for this project had been standardized nationally, schools were better able to identify gifted minority students. Although the screening instruments took longer to complete than currently required activities in the district, i.e., attaching a copy of a student's report card, recent achievement test scores, and two b mehavior checklists developed by the county, schools now had the advantage of using a valid and reliable set of materials. By increasing the probability that those being referred for a full psychological would meet the established eligibility criteria, the percentage of minority students

qualifying for a gifted program increased from 34 percent to 80 percent.

A third goal of this practicum proposal was to increase the percentage of students in prekindergarten through Grade 2 by using the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire, a rating scale which could be administered to parents, in addition to using the K-BIT. The use of a parent interview form was advocated by many researchers such as Eby 1983, Fraiser 1989; Robinson, Roedel, & Jackson, 1980; Clark, 1988; and Burns, Mathews, & Mason, 1990. Another suggestion made in the literature included the use of nonverbal assessment instruments (Fraiser, 1989; 1981; Glassnapp et al., 1981; Renzuilli, 1981, Bernal, 1978). These conclusions confirmed that the use of the K-BIT in conjunction with the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire would probabily serve as effective screening instruments for the identification of children between the ages of four to six years old.

During the implementation of this practicum, this writer conducted the social history interview in the region office. Students obtaining an index score of 5 or 6 on the Self-Help Social Profile Questionnaire and an IQ score of 118 or above on the K-BIT were referred to their homeschool for a formal evaluation. This procedure was implemented at one school in the region, the only school composed of prekindergarten and kindergarten students. Also, inservice training was provided to the entire staff, the assistant principal, teachers, and teacher assistants. At the conclusion of this project, seven

students had been screened and three were referred for further testing.

Since the primary objective of gifted education is early identification, requiring that these screening activities be completed prior to referring children between the age of 6 has not only reduced the hesitancy of psychologists to test these children, but has increased the amount of students in prekindergarten to Grade 2 being screened from 37 percent to 57 percent, an increase of 20 percent. Another positive outcome was that the percentage of students referred in Grades 4 and 5 decreased from 43 percent to 16 percent.

Objective 4 focused on increasing the understanding teachers and counselors (the primary people responsible for referring potential gifted students) have about the nature of gifted students. Issues related to eligibility criteria were also addressed. In order to accomplish this goal, ten hours of inservice training were provided to each of the school contacts delegated the responsibility of supervising the implementation of this screening project. Each of the training sessions was 2 1/2 hours and was arranged so that no more than 20 participants were in attendance at one time. These workshops were designed to approximate the format used by Gear (1978). Therefore, at each session the participants were provided with packets of information which could be used at their school site. Although Gear (1978) suggests providing five training sessions, there were only four

scheduled. However, it should be noted that this writer provided onsite assistance to schools that needed extra help.

The research also suggested that inservice training be provided to school counselors (Gowan & Burch, 1971), administrators (Clark, 1988), and psychologists (Sattler, 1988; Samuda, 1975; Klausmeirer, Mishra, & Maker, 1987. A review of the sign-in sheet from the inservice training sessions indicated the above requirements were met. For example, of the people trained 3 were psychologists, 3 were assistant principals, 7 were teachers, 2 were teachers of the gifted, 2 were academic excellence teachers, and 12 were school guidance counselors. Based upon the percentage of students who had been screened prior to be being referred for gifted testing during this project, this author can conclude what Gear (1978) had observed in his research--people who are trained in the identification of gifted students are twice as effective in making referrals. Their knowledge of gifted characteristics was also confirmed on the posttest administered after the fourth training session. The mean score obtained on this assessment was 95, a gain of 30 points when compared with the mean scores on a survey of characteristics of the gifted.

"The problem of having too few children from nondominant ethnic groups in gifted programs...[comes from]...decisions about what evidence of actual or potential giftedness one requires (Barkan & Bernal, 1991, p.

144). But, research has also shown that schools can increase their ability to identify elementary aged minority children by enhancing the quality of screening instruments used to refer these children. These instruments should be standardized and should provide norming information, in addition to documentation about validity and reliability studies. Whenever possible, IQ tests which include performance, or nonverbal sections should be selected. These types of measures provide two advantages. First, they increase the identification of LEP children. Secondly, they increase the probability that children between the ages of 4 to 6 years old are referred. Educating professionals about the nature of gifted children is also important. It is one of the few ways we can effectively dispel myths people have about gifted children. Attempts should also be made to involve a wide variety of school officials, although in most cases the guidance counselor oversees these activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The strategies used to affect changes in the identification of gifted minority students proved to be effective during this practicum. However, many factors also presented obstacles during implementation. Therefore, the following recommendations are being offered:

a) Limit the number of schools in which the screening program will be piloted to 10 or less.

b) Train a minimum of two people from each school site.

c) Identify bilingual resource people at each school where LEP students will be screened.

Based upon the reaction to the results of this practicum, a variety of activities have been projected for the next school year. For example, this writer has been asked to speak on behalf of AGS at the next National School Psychologist's Conference (NASP). We have also discussed doing further research on the use of the Record Sheet of Gifted Screening Information. Also, at least one other region in our school district has asked for information regarding the instruments used during this practicum. At present, plans are being made to expand this program to other schools in this writer's region provided funds are available.

DISSEMINATION

Copies of this practicum report will be distributed to region and district administrators. These people include the Assistant Superintendent of Region Operations, the Director of Exceptional/Federal Programs in Region I, the Director of School Psychologists, and the Executive Director of Gifted and Allied Programs. Specially prepared copies will be sent to American Guidance Services, Inc. and Hawthorne Educational Services.

If time permits, this report will be adapted for conferences sponsored by the National Association of

the Gifted (NAG) and the Florida Association of Gifted Teachers (FLAG). Plans are also being made to prepare an article for the Gifted Child Quarterly and the Journal for the Education of the Gifted.

Teachers (FLAG). Plans are also being made to prepare an article for the Gifted Child Quarterly and the Journal for the Education of the Gifted.

REFERENCES

Alvino, J., McDonnel, R., & Richert., S. (1981). National survey of identification practices in gifted and talented education. Exceptional Children, 48 (2), pp. 124-132.

Armstrong, R. J., & Jensen, J. A. (1981) Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults. East Aurora, NY: Slosson Educational Publications.

Baldwin, A. Y. (1987). I'm black, but look at me, I am also gifted. Gifted Child Quarterely, 31(4), pp. 180-185).

Baldwin, A. Y. (1984). The Baldwin Identification Matrix 2 for the identification of the gifted and talented: A handbook for its use. New York: Trillium Press.

Baldwin, A. (1980) The Baldwin Identification Matrix, its development and use in programs for the gifted child. Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, PA.

Barkan, J. H. & Bernal, E. M. (1991). Gifted education for bilingual and limited English proficient students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 35 (3), pp. 144-147.

Beilin, H. (1965). The utilization of high level talent in lower socioeconomic groups. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 35(3), pp. 175-178.

Bernal, E. (1978). The identification of gifted chicano children. In A. Baldwin, G. Gear, & L. Lucito (Eds.), Educational planning for gifted. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Borland, J. (1978). Teacher identification of the gifted: A new look. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 2(1), pp.22-23.

Buchanan, N. K. (1987). Evaluating the identification process of a program for the gifted: A case study. Roeper Review, 9(4), pp. 231-235.

Burns, J. M., Mathews, N. F., & Mason, A. (1990). Essential steps in screening and identifying preschool gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 34(3), pp. 102-107.

Clarizio, H. F., & Mehrens, W. A. (1985). Psychometric limitations of Guildford's Structure-of-Intellect Model for identification and programming of the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(3), pp. 113-20.

Clark, B. (1988). Growing up gifted (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Cummings, W. B. (1980). Cummings Checklist of Characteristics of Gifted and Talented Children. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, PA.

Eby, J. W. (1983). Gifted behavior: A nonelitist approach. Educational Leadership, 41(8), pp. 30-36.

Fetterman, D. M. (1986). Gifted and talented education: A national test case in Peoria. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 8(2), pp. 155-166.

Fraiser, M. (1991). Disadvantaged and culturally diverse gifted students. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 14(3), pp. 234-245.

Frasier, M. M. (1989). Poor and minority students can be gifted, too! Educational Leadership,50(7), pp. 16-18.

Fraiser, M. (1987). The identification of gifted black students: Developing new perspectives. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 3(4), pp. 225-227.

Gear, G. H. (1976). Accuracy of teacher judgement in identifying gifted children: A review of the literature. Gifted Child Quarterly, 20, pp. 478-490.

Gear, G. H. (1978). Effects of training on teachers' accuracy in the identification of gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 22, pp. 90-97.

Glasnapp, D. R., Issac, R., Hitz, J. & Carlton, R. (1981). Use of discriminant analysis in the identification of gifted students. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, New York.

Gowan, J. C. & Bruch, C. B. (1971). The academically talented student and guidance. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Harrington, J., Harrington, C., & Karns, E. (1991). The Marland Report: Twenty years later. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 15 (1), pp. 31-43.

Harris, C. R. (1991). Identifying and serving the gifted new immigrant. Teaching Exceptional Children, 23(4), pp. 26-30.

Harrison, P. L., Sparrow, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. V. (1990) Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Hartsough, C. S., Elias, P., & Wheeler, P. (1983). Evaluation of a nonintellectual assessment procedure for early screening of exceptionality. Journal of School Psychology, 21, pp. 133-142.

Haznedar, B. K., & Chissom, B. S. (1981). Use of the D-48 Test to identify gifted disadvantaged third- and fourth-grade elementary school children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 240)

Hewrsberger, J., & Asher, W., (1980). Comment on a quota system. Gifted Child Quarterely, 24, p. 96.

Jacobs, J. (1971). Effectiveness of teacher and parent identification of gifted children as a function of school level. Psychology in the Schools, 8, pp. 140-142.

Karnes, M. B. (1987). For parents and teachers of gifted and talented children. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service, Inc.

Karnes, M. B., & Johnson, J. J. (1991). The preschool primary gifted child. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 14 (3), pp. 267283.

Karnes, A., & Oehler, J. (1986). Comparison of the renormed Slosson Intelligence Test with the WISC-R for gifted students. Educational and Psychological Research, 6 (8), pp. 207-211.

Kaufman, A. S. & Kaufman, N. L. (1990). Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service Inc.

Ketchum, W. A., & Daoud, M. R. (1976). How should the gifted be defined and identified. Innovator, 8, p. 10.

Klausmeier, K., Mishra, S. P., Maker, C. J. (1987). Identification of gifted learners: A national survey of assessment practices and training needs of school psychologists. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(3), pp. 135-7.

LeRose, B. (1978). A quota system for gifted minority children: A viable solution. Gifted Child Quarterly, 22, pp. 394-403.

Marland, S. P. Jr. (1971). Education of the gifted and talented, Vol. 1. Report to the Congress of the United States by the US Commissioner of Education.

McCarney, S. B. (1987). The Gifted Evaluation Scale technical manual. Columbia, MO: Hawthorne Educational Services.

Meeker, M. R., Meeker, R. & Roid, G. (1985). Structure-of Intellect--Learning Abilities Test (SOI-LA). Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Mercer, J. R. (1979). System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment technical manual. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.

Mercer, J. & Lewis, J. (1977). Parent and interview manual: System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Ortiz, V. Z. & Gonzalez, A. (1989). Validation of a short form of the WISC-R test with accelerated and gifted Hispanic students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 33(4), pp. 152-155.

Paasow, A. (1982). The gifted disadvantaged: Some reflections. In Identifying and educating disadvantaged gifted/talented. Selected proceedings from the fifth national conference on disadvantaged gifted/talented. Los Angeles, CA: The National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and the Talented.

Parke, B. N. (1989). Educating the gifted and talented: An agenda for the future. Educational Leadership, 49(7), p. 5.

Pegnato, C. & Birch, J. (1959). Locating gifted children in junior high schools: A comparison of methods. Exceptional Children, 25, pp. 300-304.

Raven, J. C., Court, J. H., & Raven, J. (1986). Raven's Progressive Matrices. London: Lewis.

Renzulli, J. S. (1981). The revolving door model: A new way of identifying the gifted. Phi Delta Kappan, May, pp. 648-649.

Renzuilli, J. S. (1973). Talent potential in minority group students. Exceptional Children, 39(6), pp. 437-444.

Renzuilli, J. S. & Hartman, R. (1971). Scale for rating behavorial characteristics of superior students. Exceptional Children, 38(3), pp. 243-248.

Renzuilli, J. S., Reis, S. M., & Smith. L. H. (1981). The revolving door identification model. Mansfield Center, Conn.: Creative Learning Press.

Renzuilli, J. & Smith, L. (1977). Two approaches to identification of gifted students.Exceptional Children, 43, pp. 512-518.

Florida Department of Education, Division of Public Schools and the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students. (1984). Report of the gifted and talented program study. Tallahassee, FL.

Richert, E. S., Alvino, J. J., & McDonnel, R. C. (1982). Assessment and recommendations for gifted and talented youth. Roeper Review, 5(2), p. 48.

Robinson, H. B., Rodedell, W. C., & Jackson, N. E. (1980). Gifted young children. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Robinson, H., Roedell, W., & Jackson, N. (1979). Early identification and intervention. The gifted and talented. Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sattler, J. M. (1988). Assessment of children (3rd ed.). San Diego, CA: Jerome M. Sattler, Publisher.

Taylor, C. (1978). How many types of giftedness can your program tolerate? Journal of Creative Behavior, 12, pp. 39-51.

Torrance, E. P. (1968). Finding hidden talents among disadvantaged children. Gifted Child Quarterely, 12(3), pp. 131-137.

Tuttle, F. B., Jr., Becker, L. A., & Sousa, J. A. (1988). Characteristics and identifications of gifted and talented students, (3rd ed.). Washington, D. C. : National Eduction Association.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (1989). The role of the family in the success of disadvantaged gifted learners. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 13(1), pp. 22-36.

Vassar, W. G. (Eds.) (1979). Conn-cept I: Practical suggestions for gifted and talented program development. Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education.

Whitmore, J. (1985). New challenges to common identification practices. In J. Freeman (Ed.), Psychology of Gifted Children, pp. 93-113. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, F. E. (1972). A total creativity program for individualizing and humanizing the learning process. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

APPENDIX A

RECORD SHEET OF GIFTED SCREENING INFORMATION

REGION I
RECORD SHEET OF GIFTED SCREENING INFORMATION

94

Student_____Age_____Sex_____

Current
Grade_____School_____

Referring
Teacher_____Date_____

Recommendations:

1.	Refer for a gifted evaluation	_____yes	_____no
2.	Would benefit from an Academic Excellence Program: TEAM - Teaming Enrichment Activities to Minorities	_____yes	_____no
	ULTRA- Using Language and Thinking to Reason Analytically	_____yes	_____no
3.	Would benefit from a Talented Program	_____yes	_____no
4.	Would benefit from advanced instruction: Honors Classes	_____yes	_____no
	AP - Advanced Placement Classes	_____yes	_____no
	MID - Motivation in Depth(Science Program)-Summer	_____yes	_____no
	DAMP - Deep Accelerated Mathematics Program-Summer	_____yes	_____no
5.	Would benefit from a mentorship program: Community Laboratory Research Program	_____yes	_____no
	Executive Internship	_____yes	_____no
6.	Should be referred to the school guidance counselor	_____yes	_____no

Comments:_____

_____

_____

8-30-92/rls

GIFTED SCREENING INFORMATION RECORD SHEET

The Gifted Screening Information Record Sheet has been designed to assist the M-Team in deciding whether or not to refer an "enabled learner" for a formal gifted evaluation by comparing scores from a variety of screening instruments.

Space has been provided on the Matrix so that the referring teacher/counseling can record information and/or scores from a variety of instruments. Each score needs to be recorded in the column that corresponds with the student's standard score, percentile, or grade point average.

DIRECTIONS:Data from each of the following instruments needs to be recorded on the Gifted Screening Information Record Sheet: K-BIT (Composite, Verbal, and Performance), Countywide Testing (use the percentiles from each of sections of the Stanford Achievement Test-Reading, Math Computation and Math Application), Hawthorne's Gifted Evaluation Scale (for each of the five subscales), Grade Point Average (composite and by area), and the Self-Help/Social Profile Questionnaire <u>for students of prekindergarten age through 1st grade.</u>

Once all the scores have been entered the following steps need to be taken:

1. Tally the number of scores in each of the columns.
2. Multiply by the correct weighing from 1 to 5.
3. Add the scores from left to right.
4. Enter the total weighted score and divide by the number of screening instruments from which scores have been recorded.
5. If the final quotient is at least 3.0 and the K-BIT score is 115 or higher the student should be referred for a gifted evaluation. Referrals for Students who receive a score of 2.6 or higher and have a K-BIT score of 115 or higher should be reviewed carefully.
6. Then complete the cover sheet and attach all screening information. If a gifted evaluation is recommended attach the screening documentation to the M-Team for an Initial Evaluation, send home Parent Consent for Evaluation, and mark recommendation 1.
7. An appropriate recommendation should be selected or a comment written for students who are not being referred for a gifted evaluation. The K-BIT Report to Examinees and Parents with accompanying scores should be sent home.

GIFTED SCREENING INFORMATION RECORD SHEET

ASSESSMENT ITEMS	SCORES				
	5	4	3	2	1
1. IQ SCREENING SCORE	140+	139-130	129-120	119-110	109-100
Composite Score					
Verbal Score					
Performance Score					
ACHIEVEMENT TEST	95%	90-94%	89-85%	84-80%	79-75%
2. Composite Score					
3. Reading Score					
4. Vocabulary Score					
5. Math Application					
6. Math Computation					
GIFTED BEHAVIOR CHECKLIST (use either raw scores on the GES or percentiles)	95%	94-90%	89-85%	84-80%	79-75%
	65-62	61-58	57-55	54-52	51-48
7. Intellectual Subscale Score					
	50-47	46-45	44-42	41-40	39-37
8. Creativity Subscale Score					
	35-33	32-31	30-29	28	27-26
9. Specific Academic Aptitude Score					
	50-47	46-45	44-42	41-40	39-37
10. Leadership Ability Score					
	40-38	37-36	35-34	33-32	31-30
11. Visual/Performing Arts Score					
12. Other Gifted Checklist	Sup.	V.Good	Good	Average	Below Avg.

13. GRADE POINT AVERAGE	4.0-3.5	3.4-3.0	2.9-2.5	2.4-2.0	1.9-1.0
Composite G.P.A.					
Reading/Language Arts					
Math					
Science					
Art/Music					
14. SELF-HELP/SOCIAL PROFILE	**Screening Index**				
	6	5	4	3	2-1
Cognitive/Language					
Motor					
Self-Help Social:Parent					
COLUMN TALLY OF CHECKS	5X	4X	3X	2X	1X
ADD ACROSS					
TOTAL SCORE _____	TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS _____/_____=_____				

Submitted by Gale Kofsky in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in Special Education for Nova University, 1991.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF GIFTED IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES

A SURVEY OF GIFTED IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES

This survey is being distributed to collect data about identification procedures and practices currently used to refer elementary students for gifted testing. The information collected from this survey will be used to design inservice training for schools in Region I during the 1991-92 school year. We would appreciate it greatly if you could complete this form and return it to: #9575, Region I ESE Dept., Attention: Gale Kofsky.

1. What is your present job title?

a)_____Principal
b)_____Assistant Principal
c)_____Guidance Counselor
d)_____Elementary Teacher
e)_____Other (specify)

2. What is the approximate number of children enrolled at your school?

a)_____Under 500 students
b)_____501 to 600 students
c)_____601 to 700 students
d)_____701 to 800 students
e)_____801 to 900 students
f)_____901 to 1,000 students
g)_____ over 1,000 students

3. How many students at your school are currently enrolled in a gifted program?

a)_____none (0)
b)_____1 to 2 students
c)_____3 to 5 students
d)_____6 to 8 students
e)_____9 to 10 students
f)_____11 to 15 students
g)_____16 to 20 students
h)_____more than 20 students

4. How many students in your school were referred for a gifted evaluation during the last year?

a)_____none
b)_____1 to 3 students
c)_____4 to 6 students
d)_____7 to 10 students
e)_____11 to 15 students
f)_____16 to 20 students
g)_____more than 20 students

5. Of those tested for gifted last year, how many were determined to be eligible for placement in a program?

a)_____none
b)_____ 1 student
c)_____ 2 to 3 students
d)_____ 4 to 5 students
e)_____ 6 to 8 students
f)_____ more than 9 students

Screening is a process by which a rapid assessment is made to identify cnadidates for further evaluation.

6. Indicate instrument(s) and cut-off scores(s) used at your school to identify students for further evaluation for the gifted program. (Check all that apply).

a)_____Standardized Achievement test
Give name_____
Give cut-off score_____
b)_____Group-administered intelligence test
Give name_____
Give cut-off score_____
c)_____Gifted Characteristics Checklist
Give name_____
Give cut-off score_____
d)_____Slosson Intelligence Test
Give cut-off score_____
e)_____Grades
Give cut-off score_____
f)_____Other - Explain_____

7. Who screens students for the gifted program by reviewing scores referred to in Question #6?

a)_____regular classroom teacher
b)_____counselor
c)_____teacher of the gifted
d)_____a school administrator
e)_____school psychologist
f)_____other - Explain:_____

8. Who is most likely to refer a student for the gifted program?

a)_____classroom teacher
b)_____counselor
c)_____teacher of the gifted
d)_____a school administrator
e)_____parent
f) other - Explain:_____

9. Which of the following statements best expresses your attitude about the status of gifted referrals at your school?

a)_____The staff needs inservice training in order to increase the number of students referred.
b)_____Our school needs additional screening instruments to help reduce the number of students who must be administered a complete psychological.
c)_____Our staff needs to identify instruments that are better able to screen minority students who come from low income families and those who have limited English proficiency.
d)_____An Academic Excellence program would assist high achieving students prepare for gifted testing.
e) Other_____
_____

Read each of the statements below and mark the appropriate response.

1. Gifted children can get a good education on their own.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

2. Everyone is gifted in some way.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

3. The more intelligent child is also the more creative one.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

4. A high IQ score is a good predictor of real-world accomplishment
_____TRUE _____FALSE

5. An individual's IQ score is the same throughout his/her lifetime
_____TRUE _____FALSE

6. Teachers are better at identifying giftedness than a child's peers or parents.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

7. Gifted individuals from racial and ethnic minorities and low socioeconomic status are less likely to be identified.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

8. Gifted children often challenge the authority of the teacher and are disruptive and/or disrespectful.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

9. Work that is too easy or too boring frustrates a gifted child.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

10. Some gifted children may perform poorly or even fail subjects in which they are bored or unmotivated.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

11. Gifted children are more challenged and more motivated when they work with students at their level of ability.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

12. Commonly used sequences of learning are often inappropriate and can be damaging to gifted learners.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

13. Gifted children, while intered in many things, usually are not gifted therapy.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

14. If not challenged, gifted children can waste their ability and become mediocre, average learners.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

15. Gifted children often express their idealism and sense of justice at a very early age.
_____TRUE _____FALSE

APPENDIX C

ASSESSMENT OF CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTEDNESS

CHARACTERISTICS OF GIFTEDNESS

Read each of the statements below and mark the appropriate response.

1. Gifted children can get a good education on their own.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

2. Everyone is gifted in some way.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

3. The more intelligent child is also the more creative one.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

4. A high IQ score is a good predictor of real-world accomplishment.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

5. An individual's IQ score is the same throughout his/her lifetime.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

6. Teachers are better at identifying giftedness than a child's peers or parents.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

7. Gifted individuals from racial and ethnic minorities and low socioeconomic status are less likely to be identified.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

8. Gifted children often challenge the authority of the teacher and are disruptive and/or disrespectful.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

9. Work that is too easy or too boring frustrates a gifted child.
   _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

10. Some gifted children may perform poorly or even fail subjects in which they are bored or unmotivated.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

11. Gifted children are more challenged and more motivated when they work with students at their level of ability.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

12. Commonly used sequences of learning are often inappropriate and can be damaging to gifted learners.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

13. Gifted children, while interested in many things, usually have difficulty focusing on one task.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

14. If not challenged, gifted children can waste their ability and become mediocre, average learners.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

15. Gifted children often express their idealism and sense of justice at a very early age.
    _____ TRUE _____ FALSE

APPENDIX D

PILOT GIFTED SCREENING LOG SHEET

GIFTED IDENTIFICATION PILOT PROGRAM
LOG SHEET

SCHOOL:_____

SCHOOL CONTACT:_____

MONTH:_____

Please complete the questions listed below and send this form to the Region Office no later than the first week of each month.

1. How many students were screened for gifted this month using the K-BIT?

PK_____K_____1st_____2nd_____3rd_____4th_____5th_____Total____

2. How many of the students screened with the enhanced referral activities (K-BIT, MATRIX, Hawthorne's Gifted Evaluation Scale, AGS Social/Self-Help Profile) were recommended for a formal gifted evaluation?

Students referred for a gifted evaluation_____

3. How many of those students referred for a formal gifted evaluation after being screened met criteria for a gifted placement? How many did not meet criteria?

Met criteria _____Did not meet criteria_____

Please feel free to share any problems or positive outcomes in the section below.

FEEDBACK_____

_____

_____

_____